N521GRI1

```
1
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
      KATHRYN TOWNSEND GRIFFIN, et
      al.,
 4
                     Plaintiffs,
5
                 v.
                                               17 Cv 5221 (LLS)
6
      EDWARD CHRISTOPHER SHEERAN, personally
 7
      known as Ed Sheeran, et al.,
 8
                     Defendants.
9
                                                New York, N.Y.
10
                                                May 2, 2023
                                                11:11 a.m.
11
      Before:
12
                           HON. LOUIS L. STANTON,
13
                                                District Judge
14
                                                - and a Jury -
15
16
                                 APPEARANCES
17
      FRANK & ASSOCIATES PC
      BY: PATRICK RYAN FRANK
18
           KEISHA RICE
           KATHERINE VIKER
19
           - and -
      BEN CRUMP LAW
20
      BY: BENJAMIN CRUMP
           Attorneys for Plaintiffs
21
      PRYOR CASHMAN LLP
22
           Attorneys for Defendants
      BY: ILENE SUSAN FARKAS
23
           DONALD S. ZAKARIN
           ANDREW MARK GOLDSMITH
24
           BRIAN MAIDA
25
      ALSO PRESENT:
      KIM PASSEY, paralegal
```

ALL COUNSEL: Good morning.

THE COURT: If you want to sit down, sit down.

(Jury present)

MS. FARKAS: The defense would like to continue with the examination of Dr. Lawrence Ferrara.

THE COURT: Then where is he?

Good morning.

You're still under oath.

THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes.

THE COURT: That does not affect the piano playing.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

14 LAWRENCE FERRARA PhD, resumed.

15 | DIRECT EXAMINATION CONTINUED

16 BY MS. FARKAS:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

- Q. Good morning, Dr. Ferrara.
- 18 A. Good morning.
- 19 Q. Directing your attention back to "Thinking Out Loud," did
- 20 you transcribe the composition embodied in the sound recording
- 21 of "Thinking Out Loud"?
- 22 | A. Yes, I did.
- 23 \ Q. And can you explain what it means to transcribe the
- 24 composition that's embodied in the sound recording of "Thinking"

25 | Out Loud."

A. Yes. A transcription is putting into written notation the music that's embodied in a sound recording. The process that I use is to listen to the work in its entirety many times, but then to zoom in to specific sections to start the transcription process — that is, taking note by note and putting it into a notational software — and in so doing, I put the audio into a media player. There are several that are available. And what it allows me to do is to loop various sections. So I can literally loop a section that's three seconds or four seconds or more. And a loop means to just automatically repeat it over and over again. It allows me to get a sense of what I'm hearing, then to really zoom in to begin to write out, via that software, each note, each chord, each lyric.

And then with respect to chords and to melody, I can also match at the piano, which is right next to my keyboard for the computer, and so it's a really slow and systematic, deliberate process, so that you get the transcription that really does represent the composition embodied in the sound recording.

Q. Thank you.

What elements of "Thinking Out Loud" did you transcribe?

- A. I transcribed both the music and the lyrics.
- Q. And after you transcribed "Thinking Out Loud," did you compare your transcription against the published sheet music

1 | for "Thinking Out Loud"?

A. Yes, I did.

2

- Q. And what did you find?
- 4 A. I found that my transcription of the vocal melody, the
- 5 | melody that Ed Sheeran sings, was the same as the vocal melody
- 6 | in the published sheet music. My transcription of the chord
- 7 | symbols is the same as that in the published sheet music, and
- 8 | my transcription of the lyrics were also the same as in the
- 9 published sheet music.
- 10 | Q. And is what we're looking at here the published sheet music
- 11 | for "Thinking Out Loud"?
- 12 | A. Yes, it is.
- 13 Q. Overall, did your transcriptions differ at all from the
- 14 | topline of the published sheet music?
- 15 | A. There we go. So by the topline, we're talking about this
- 16 | literally, this top line, or musical staff, and on this
- 17 | topline, we have the chord symbols on top, the vocal melody,
- 18 these notes that are in the staff, and then of course you can
- 19 | see two verse lyrics the first verse lyrics and the second
- 20 | verse lyrics. This topline is consistent, exactly consistent,
- 21 | with my transcription.
- 22 The bottom two lines are the piano arrangement, and
- 23 | that is not what I transcribed. I transcribed the melody, the
- 24 | harmony, which would be the chords, and the lyrics.
- 25 | Q. And you mentioned the piano accompaniment in the bottom two

6

7

8

20

21

22

- lines. Is that piano accompaniment in the recording of Thinking Out Loud"?
  - A. It is not. It is a piano arrangement.
- Q. Apart from the materials that we've already discussed, did you review any other materials in performing your analysis?
  - A. Yes. I reviewed many works that predate LGO or TOL, and I also reviewed works of Ed Sheeran and of Amy
    - Q. Wadge. It's —
- 9 A. Yes, I'm always considerate of pronouncing it correctly,
  10 but it is Wadge, I believe.
- 12 Q. What are the component elements of music that you analyzed in this case?
- 13 A. The fundamental elements of music are the structure, the
  14 harmony, the melody, the rhythm, and the lyrics. There are
  15 other elements that are not fundamental. For example, the key,
  16 the meter, the overall genre, or style, those are not as
  17 fundamental because they're essentially musical ideas and
  18 musical building blocks that are commonplace, whereas the
  19 actual expression in the melody and harmony and the lyrics, so
  - Q. Are "Let's Get It On" and "Thinking Out Loud" written in the same key?

forth, would be considered much more fundamental.

- 23 A. No. "Thinking Out Loud" is written and recorded in the key
  24 of D. LGO is record is written in the key of E flat.
- 25 | They're both major, so D major in TOL, E flat major in LGO.

3

10

11

12

670

1 Q. In assessing the two songs in this case, did you consider

- A. Key is not an important factor with respect to copying.
- 4 One needs to establish what key the work is in, but the point
- 5 is that whether a work is in E flat major or D major would not
- 6 be necessarily important in figuring out whether you think
- 7 | there's evidence of copying.

key to be an important factor?

- Q. Let's discuss the other elements in the "Let's Get It On"
  sheet music.
  - We're looking at Joint Exhibit 2 here. In addition to key and meter, what other musical elements are included in the "Let's Get It On" sheet music?
- 13 A. Melody, harmony, and lyrics.
- 14 | Q. Anything else?
- 15 | A. No.
- Q. Can you please show us where we can find those elements in
- 17 | the "Let's Get It On" deposit copy sheet music.
- 18 A. The harmony and that is the chord symbols as you can
- 19 see, are right above the staff: E flat, G minor, A flat, B flat
- 20 | 7. Beneath it is the melody, and that, once again, is
- 21 represented by the notes that are within the staff. And below
- 22 | each staff are the lyrics.
- 23 | Q. Is there a tempo notated in the deposit copy?
- 24 A. No, there is no tempo in the LGO deposit copy.
- 25 | Q. And does "Thinking Out Loud" include a tempo?

- A. Yes, the slide that we just saw, in fact, had a tempo marking of 80 beats per minute.
- 3 | Q. And in addition to tempo, are there other elements in
- 4 | "Thinking Out Loud" that are not notated in the "Let's Get It
- 5 On" sheet music?
- 6 A. Yes.

- Q. Does "Thinking Out Loud" include a bass part?
- 8 A. No, it does not.
- 9 Q. "Thinking Out Loud."
- 10 A. Oh, "Thinking Out Loud." I'm sorry. Yes, "Thinking Out
- 11 | Loud" has a bass part.
- 12 | Q. And what about "Let's Get It On," does that have a bass
- 13 | part?
- 14 A. "Let's Get It On" does not have a bass part.
- 15 | Q. And does "Thinking Out Loud" include drums?
- 16 A. Yes, it does.
- 17 | Q. And does "Let's Get It On" notate drums?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 | Q. Is it possible to notate a drum part on sheet music?
- 20 A. Yes, of course.
- 21 Q. So let's delve into the chord progressions at issue in this
- 22 | case in some more detail.
- 23 What is the chord progression in "Let's Get It On"?
- 24 A. In "Let's Get It On," it's E flat. And if I don't say E
- 25 | flat minor, it means it's E flat major. So E flat, G minor, A

1 | flat, B flat 7.

- Q. And what does that correspond to in Roman numerals?
- 3 A. In Roman numerals, it corresponds, as you can see, to an
- 4 upper case I for the E flat, a lower case iii for the G minor,
- and upper case IV for the A flat, and an upper case V for the B
- 6 | flat.

- 7 Q. And we have seen sometimes that the fourth chord on "Let's
- 8 | Get It On" is notated with a 7 after it; is that correct?
- 9 A. That is correct. That is the way it's marked in the sheet
- 10 music.
- 11 | Q. And can you explain the 7 next to the V chord.
- 12 A. Yes, the 7 after the the V represents an added pitch.
- 13 Each of those chords that we just saw are triads. That is,
- 14 | they're chords consisting of three notes, and the name of the
- 15 chord for example, E flat is the root and the lowest note
- of the chord, the way these are marked. The exception is the
- 17 V7. That adds a fourth pitch, which is the interval of a
- 18 seventh above the root. That specific note is an A flat.
- 19 | Q. Can you please play this chord progression on the piano.
- 20 | A. Yes. Here is the chord progression. That's the first
- 21 chord. This is in E flat. One, two, three, four . . .
- 22 | (playing piano). And that is just the chord progression. I'm
- 23 | not playing it in any particular harmonic rhythm other than
- 24 making each chord even, each chord at two beats.
- 25 | Q. What is the basic four-chord progression in "Let's Get It

Ferrara - Direct

On"?

1

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. In a basic chord progression, musicologists often try to consolidate, remove, add pitches, so the basic chord progression would be the same chord progression except taking the 7 off of the V, and that would result in this (playing piano). That doesn't erase the fact that the 7 is in the sheet
- progression is is written, it always has the seventh on that
  fourth chord of the four-chord progression, but once again, for
  the purposes of analysis, we talk about a basic chord

progression and that's what it is.

music. It is part of the composition. Each time this chord

- Q. Let's move on to the chords in "Thinking Out Loud." What are your findings regarding the chord progressions in "Thinking Out Loud"?
- A. The chord progression in "Thinking Out Loud" is different.

  The fourth chord is different. But most important is that

  there are multiple chord progressions in "Thinking Out Loud."
- Q. What do you mean there are multiple chord progressions in "Thinking Out Loud"?
- A. Well, they can be divided in half. There are multiple chord progressions that have some similarity to the chord progression in "Let's Get It On," and then there are other chord progressions that are significantly different from any chord progression in "Let's Get It On."
- Q. What are the chord progressions in "Thinking Out Loud" that

Ferrara - Direct

have some similarity to the chord progressions in "Let's Get It On"?

A. Well, this is a slide that I understand Dr. Stewart showed. This is my slide. And it is meant to show at least five — there are more, but five of the similar chord progressions that are in TOL, with LGO's chord progression on top.

So as you can see, at the topline, LGO, I, iii, IV, V, VII. These are not the basic chord progressions; these are the chord progressions as they're actually played.

So in TOL, I-V, without getting into the theory, simply means that the third of the chord is missing. I/3 is the one chord with the third of the bass, the IV is the IV chord, as we expect, and the V has a different pitch. It's basically a suspended II chord. Without getting any further into it, essentially each one of these represents a chord progression in TOL. And there are others, but there are similarities, you can see, to the chord progression in "Let's Get It On."

- Q. Of the five "Thinking Out Loud" chord progressions in the chart on the screen, which is the closest to the I-iii-IV-V chord progression in "Let's Get It On"?
- A. In TOL No. 4, one can readily see that the I would be the same as as the I in LGO; the I/3 of course is different as compared to the iii; but then the IV and the V and, if we were to go to the basic chord progression in LGO and drop the VII,

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

18

19

20

- then it would be very close.
- Q. And is there another name that you would use to refer to this TOL No. 4?
- A. Yes. I'm referring to this as the basic chord progression in TOL that is at issue.
  - Q. And when you say basic chord progression, can you explain what again, what you mean by that.
    - A. Yes. As per my explanation a moment ago, each of these chords consists of three pitches, and so there are no added chords, no added pitches.
    - Q. And does the slide that we're looking at include all of the different chord progressions that appear in "Thinking Out
- 13 | Loud"?
- 14 A. No, it doesn't include any of those different chord progressions.
- Q. Lastly, regarding the chord progression at issue, is the LGO chord progression the same as the TOL chord progression?
  - A. No. As you can see, none of these similar chord progressions are the same. The closest would be TOL No. 4.
  - Q. Could you please play for us the LGO chord progression followed by the TOL chord progression at the piano, please.
- A. Yes. Once again, without any harmonic rhythm, just playing
  the chords, and so that we can hear them in the same key, I'm
  going to start with LGO in the key of D major and then do the
  TOL, also in the key of d major.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So this is LGO: (playing piano). And now here is TOL: (playing piano). Those are the basic chord progressions in both.

- Q. You mentioned prior art before, briefly. Could you explain what a prior art search is.
- A. Yes. In doing a prior art search, you look for literally works that predate one or both of the songs at issue, and in this case, that would be 1973 for "Let's Get It On" and 2014 for TOL. And given the similarities that are at issue, you look to earlier works that embody those similarities that are at issue.
  - Q. And as a general matter, how do you perform a prior art search when you're dealing with chord progressions?
  - A. I have a library of method books, of sheet music and books and so forth. There are online indices. And so I look through those in order to find, locate, identify, and then ultimately do the analysis of prior art.
  - Q. In connection with this case did you conduct a prior art search for songs that use the same basic chord progressions in "Let's Get It On" and "Thinking Out Loud"?
- A. Yes, I did complete a prior art search with respect to the basic chord progressions in both works.
- 23 | Q. And how did you conduct that search?
- 24 A. Essentially the same way I just described a moment ago.
- 25 | Q. How many songs did you review in performing your search?

- 1 A. Several hundred.
- 2 Q. And when you found a song that used the same basic chord
- 3 | progressions in "Thinking Out Loud" or "Let's Get It On," did
- 4 | you do anything to record your findings?
- 5 A. I created a list of those songs that embody either the TOL
- 6 or the LGO basic chord progression.
- 7 | Q. And at the end of your search, how many songs did you find
- 8 | that used the same basic chord progressions in "Let's Get It
- 9 On" or "Thinking Out Loud"?
- 10 A. 101 songs.
- 11 Q. I'd like to show you what's been marked for identification
- 12 | as Defendant's Exhibit 210.
- Do you recognize this document?
- 14 A. Yes, I do.
- 15 Q. And what is this document?
- 16 A. This is the list of the 101 prior art works.
- 17 | Q. And does this document accurately reflect the names of the
- 18 | 101 songs that you found that use the same basic chord
- 19 | progressions in "Let's Get It On" and "Thinking Out Loud"?
- 20 A. Yes, it does.
- 21 MS. FARKAS: Your Honor, I'd like to move Exhibit 210
- 22 | into evidence.
- 23 MR. FRANK: We would object, your Honor, based on
- 24 hearsay. It's an expert report. The best evidence is
- 25 Dr. Ferrara's testimony. I would also note that Dr. Stewart's

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

678

1 report elements were left out based on the same basis.

MS. FARKAS: Your Honor, the plaintiff's motion in

limine on this evidence was already denied. And it's not

hearsay. It's just a list of Dr. Ferrara's findings. He can

he's already testified that he conducted a search and

— he's already testified that he conducted a search and

6 created a list.

THE COURT: Received.

(Defendant's Exhibit 210 received in evidence)

BY MS. FARKAS:

- Q. How many songs did you find that use the same basic chord progression in "Let's Get It On"?
- 12 A. 80.
- 13 Q. And how many of those songs were created before "Let's Get
- 14 | It On"?
- 15 || A. 33.
- Q. How many songs did you find that used the same basic chord
- 17 | progression in "Thinking Out Loud"?
- 18 A. 21.
- 19 Q. And how many of those were created before "Let's Get It
- 20 | On"?
- 21 | A. Four.
- 22 | Q. And as between the basic chord progression in "Let's Get It
- 23 | On" and the basic chord progression in "Thinking Out Loud,"
- 24 | which one did you find to be more common?
- 25 A. The basic chord progression in "Let's Get It On" is far

4

5

6

7

11

12

13

14

24

25

- more common than the basic chord progression in TOL.
- Q. But would your opinion be that "Thinking Out Loud" chord progression is also considered common?
  - A. Yes, it is.

alone "Let's Get It On."

- Q. What significance, if any, do you find in the fact that 80 songs out of the several hundred that you reviewed have the same chord progression that is in "Let's Get It On"?
- A. When there are so many works that have an element that's at issue in common, it makes much less likely the copying by the writers of TOL of any one of those particular 80 songs, let
  - Q. And how, if at all, does that inform your opinion as to whether the authors of "Thinking Out Loud" copied from "Let's Get It On"?
- 15 Once again, it supports my finding that there is no musicological evidence of copying. And it establishes, once 16 17 again, two things: one, the commonplace status of the chord progression — indeed, the chord progression would be 18 considered a musical building block, and that once again cuts 19 20 against the idea of copying; and secondly, that it's clear that "Let's Get It On" was not nearly the first to use this chord 21 22 progression; there are at least 33 songs that predate it that 23 used the same chord progression.
  - Q. And to be clear, do you believe that the 80 songs that you identified that use the basic "Let's Get It On" chord

1

8

progression are the only songs in history that were authored

- before "Thinking Out Loud" that used this basic chord 2
- progression? 3
- 4 A. No. I'm confident that if I spent more time on a prior art
- 5 search, I would find additional works.
- Q. Dr. Ferrara, I'd like you to look at what's been marked for 6 7 identification as Defendant's Exhibit 201.
  - Do you recognize this document?
- This is the first page is the cover, the book 9 10 cover, of a book called Money Chords, subtitled A Songwriter's 11 Sourcebook of Popular Chord Progressions.
- 12 MS. FARKAS: Your Honor, I'd like to move Exhibit 201 13 into evidence.
- 14 Objection, your Honor; hearsay, relevance. MR. FRANK:
- MS. FARKAS: Your Honor, we're not offering it for the 15 truth of what's in the book; we're simply offering it to show 16 17 that the LGO chord progression is taught in beginner guitar and
- 18 piano books.
- 19 THE COURT: Received.
- 20 (Defendant's Exhibit 201 received in evidence)
- 21 BY MS. FARKAS:
- 22 Dr. Ferrara, what's the significance of Exhibit 201?
- 23 If we go to the third page that's within the book, you can 24 see at the bottom of the page, page 57, and at the top, it has
- 25 what's called a rock ballad chord progression. And that arrow

is my arrow. It's my handwritten arrow so that I could make it easier for you to see it. And you can see that the description is the most frequent progressions that begin with the E chord and then move to the G sharp chord. And so this E, G sharp minor, Ab7 chord progression is the identical — not the basic chord progression but the identical chord progression in "Let's Get It On." It just happens to be based on the key of E, not based on the key of E flat.

In addition, in the preface of this book, the author notes that chord progressions are "basic building blocks," as I called them as well. So this would be one of those basic building blocks that the author is pointing to.

And in the appendix of the book, the author names the

— what the author thinks is the 80 most popular chord

progressions, and needless to say, there are many more, and

includes the chord progression that's at issue in LGO as one of
those popular chord progressions.

Q. If you could please take a look at what's been marked for identification as Defendant's Exhibit 202.

And if you could tell us if you recognize this document.

A. Yes. This is the book cover, and then inside the book is a repeated book cover, bibliographic page, and then some other pages from a book for advanced beginners that are on a guitar method.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ferrara - Direct

MS. FARKAS: Your Honor, we'd like to move Exhibit 202 into evidence.

> No objection, your Honor. MR. FRANK:

THE COURT: Received.

(Defendant's Exhibit 202 received in evidence)

- What is the significance of Exhibit 202, Dr. Ferrara? Ο.
- Well, the significance can be seen within the contents of the book. And just by way of example, if we could go to the third page, or — one more.

Thank you.

So this, you can see at the bottom of the page, is page 75, and I've once again put a handwritten arrow there to point to the specific chord progression at issue. You can see that above that chord progression, there are other songs that use it. It shows up in songs — I'm reading — like "I Do" by Jude, "If I Had a Hammer" by Pete Seeger, "Cruel To Be Kind," and so forth, "True Love Ways" by Buddy Holly, and the rest. And that chord progression once again is identical. In fact, now you not only have the chords, in this case written in the key of G, but you have the Roman numerals, and as you can see, they're identical to the chord progression in "Let's Get It On;" not the basic chord progression, but the chord progression as written in the deposit copy. So it even includes the V7. I, iii, IV, V7.

And if we go to the very next page, we have another

songwriter does.

chord progression at the bottom, and I have that — once again, put an arrow. This is in the key of A. A, C sharp minor, D, E7, and the Roman numerals are exactly the same as before — that is, upper case I, lower case iii, upper case IV, upper case V, with the 7. So once again, in another category — Class 8 songs is what this writer is calling them — in another category, this very same, this identical, chord progression from LGO deposit copy is here as one of those chord progressions for guitar students to learn.

- Q. And does this book make any mention of "Let's Get It On"?
- A. Yes, it does. If you look at the last page, right above my arrow, in the right column. By the way, even though "Let's Get It On" was recorded in 1973, which is after dozens of other I-iii-IV-V chords were recorded, I firmly believe that Marvin Gaye did not plagiarize the song; he was simply writing a song using a common progression, just like every other professional
- Q. Do you agree with the opinion of the author?
- A. Of the author's writing? Yes, I agree with it 100 percent. Clearly, by the time that "Let's Get It On" was written, that chord progression was common. And that is, I've already proffered 33 songs that predated that use the same basic chord progression. And so I do agree with it. And I also agree that given the commonplace nature, that there's no reason that one would think that the writers of LGO copied any one of those

- 1 songs that predated it.
- 2 Q. Can you please take a look at what has been marked for
- 3 | identification as Defendant's Exhibit 203.
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 | Q. Do you recognize this document?
- 6 A. I do. This is another music method book. This happens to
- 7 be a piano method not a guitar method, a piano method book,
- 8 and you should see, it says, "How to Play Rock 'N' Roll Piano."
- 9 And if we go to the next page —
- 10 | Q. Hold on, Dr. Ferrara. I think —
- 11 A. I'm sorry. You've got to admit it. I'm sorry. Thank you.
- MS. FARKAS: I'd like to move Exhibit 203 into
- 13 | evidence, please.
- MR. FRANK: No objection, your Honor.
- 15 THE COURT: Received.
- 16 (Defendant's Exhibit 203 received in evidence)
- 17 | Q. What is the significance of Exhibit 203?
- 18 A. We can once again go into the book. The next page, you can
- 19 see, is music. It happens to be page 84 in the book. And the
- 20 | heading is Ten Popular Rock 'N' Roll Progressions.
- 21 I should add that this book was published in 1967 —
- 22 | that is, six years before the creation of "Let's Get It On."
- 23 So this is a 1967 publication, and it lists Ten Popular Rock
- 24 | 'N' Roll Progressions. And as you can see, once again, just to
- 25 | facilitate, I put an arrow in at No. 4, and that is the C, E

- minor, F, G chord that is the basic chord progression that is in LGO.
- 3 | Q. Dr. Ferrara, have you reviewed the transcript of
- 4 Dr. Stewart's trial testimony?
  - A. Yes.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. And did you also review the PowerPoint slides that he used to demonstrate his testimony?
  - A. Yes, I did.
    - Q. I'd like to direct your attention to Dr. Stewart's testimony regarding the first 24 seconds of "Thinking Out Loud" compared to the rest of "Thinking Out Loud."
      - Setting aside for a moment the first 24 seconds, are you and Dr. Stewart in agreement as to the basic chord progression in "Thinking Out Loud" after the 24-second mark?
    - A. Yes. It is my understanding and having read his report and

       that he and I both believe that certainly after 24 seconds,

      the second chord in TOL is consistently the I/3 chord, not the

      lower case iii chord that is in LGO.
    - Q. Dr. Stewart testified that the second chord of "Thinking Out Loud" during the first 24 seconds of "Thinking Out Loud" is an F sharp minor or the iii chord as in "Let's Get It On." Do you agree with Dr. Stewart?
    - A. No. I disagree. I believe that Dr. Stewart is wrong.
- Q. Now what is your basis for saying that the second chord in Thinking Out Loud" is a D/F sharp major and not the F sharp

1 minor?

- 2 A. The basis of doing the transcription that I described
- 3 | earlier, and, in addition, to considering the vocal melody that
- 4 | is being sung with that harmony.
- Q. And is the published sheet music for "Thinking Out Loud"
- 6 consistent with your transcription and analysis?
- 7 A. Yes, the published sheet music, right from the get-go and
- 8 | through the song, wherever that chord progression at issue
- 9 occurs, has it listed as a, as you can see, a thank you a
- 10 D/F sharp, which would be a I/3 in Roman numerals.
- 11 | Q. Has Dr. Stewart been consistent on this point?
- 12 A. No, he hasn't.
- 13 | Q. Can you please explain.
- 14 A. Yes. This is example 3 from Dr. Stewart's report. This is
- 15 | Dr. Stewart's example 3. And as you can see, looking at TOL,
- 16 | first we have a time stamp, so he is saying this is at the
- 17  $\parallel$  beginning of TOL i.e., in the first 24 seconds. And as you
- 18 can see, the second chord that Dr. Stewart has written is a D/F
- 19 | sharp chord. You can see the F sharp minor chord in LGO, and
- 20 here in this report, Dr. Stewart concedes that the second chord
- 21 | in TOL is D/F sharp.
- 22 | Q. As an example of the use of these two chords, could you
- 23 | please play the portion of the vocal melody in "Thinking Out
- 24 | Loud" that is sung with the second chord, first as a D/F sharp
- 25 chord and then as an F sharp minor chord.

A. Yes. And so here is the first — just the melody, so, of "Thinking Out Loud" that plays with the D/F sharp chord: (playing piano).

Okay. We have power. (Playing piano.)

This is Dr. Stewart's transcription, and he adds a grace note. Would you like me to play it with the grace note or as per the published sheet music, which doesn't have the grace note? That's the only difference.

- Q. As the published sheet music, please.
- A. Okay. So without the grace note: (playing piano). I stopped there because that is where the melody with the D/F sharp chord occurs. And the words are "When your legs don't work like they." (Playing piano)

Okay. Now I play it with the chord. This is with the D/F sharp chord. (Playing piano)

And I just note that that very last note is a D (playing), and it essentially matches the highest note in the D/F sharp chord (playing). That's the D/F sharp chord (playing). That highest note is also the last note of the melody, so . . . (playing).

Now I do the same thing but using the F sharp minor chord.

(Playing). Play it a little louder (playing). And think about that last note once again. It was so harmonious with the D (playing) that now with the F sharp minor (playing),

it clashes. That doesn't mean that it couldn't be written by a composer, but the point is that when you play the two together, you recognize that the buoyancy and the kind of message that the opening of TOL gives is much more in line with D major, which, again, continues throughout the rest of the song, and not the F sharp minor chord.

- Q. Now let's assume for the sake of argument that the second chord in both songs was the same. Would you find that significant?
- A. It would not be significant. This is an important point. What if the chord progression in TOL that's at issue was not the I/3 but the iii? That is, what if TOL, in those parts of the song that have a chord progression at issue, had the same chord progression as "Let's Get It On," the I-iii-IV-V? It would not be significant. And the reason is that it is a musical building block. It's been used in fact it was used in 80 songs, prior to TOL. The LGO basic chord progression was used in 80 songs prior to the writers of TOL writing TOL. And therefore, it would not be significant.
- Q. Yesterday plaintiff's counsel asked Mr. Sheeran a line of questioning that suggested to Mr. Sheeran that he was wrong about the second chord in the "Thinking Out Loud" chord progression during the first 24 seconds of "Thinking Out Loud." and plaintiff's counsel also suggested that in your report that you also disagreed with Mr. Sheeran about this second chord

Case 1:17-cv-05221-LLS N521GRI1 Ferrara - Direct

- I was informed of this yesterday. I was not in the 2 Α.
- 3 courtroom, but I was informed of this. And so last night, when

during the first 24 seconds. Do you have a reaction to that?

- 4 I got home, I reviewed my report, and I didn't find any
- 5 sentence that at all suggested that the second chord in
- 6 "Thinking Out Loud" - and the chord progression at issue is F
- 7 sharp minor. I found that I'm consistent throughout that
- report. And so on that basis, Ed Sheeran and I are in 8
- 9 agreement on what that second chord is.
- 10 Setting aside the basic chord progression in "Thinking Out
- 11 Loud, " are there other chord progressions in "Thinking Out
- 12 Loud" that are more different from the basic chord progression
- 13 in "Let's Get It On"?
- 14 A. Yes, there are.

- 15 0. And in what sections of "Thinking Out Loud" do those
- different chord progressions appear? 16
- 17 The first section is in the pre-chorus sections. The chord
- 18 progression there is quite different from anything in LGO and
- 19 certainly not at issue. And then in the last two bars, bars 9
- 20 and 10 of each repeating chorus, there is a descending chord
- 21 progression that's quite different from anything at issue. If
- 22 I may, I'll play it. Yes? Okay. So here it is. This is —
- 23 these are the last two bars of the chorus in TOL. And it's a
- 24 descending chord progression. You'll hear it moving down step
- 25 by step (playing piano).

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Once again (playing). Now not only is there nothing remotely like that in "Let's Get It On," as I'll point out later, there are songs — and particularly one song, "Crazy Love" by Van Morrison, which was released three years before the creation of LGO — that has a very similar chord progression.

Q. I'd like to just briefly play 30 seconds from "Thinking Out Loud" to confirm with you that that's the section that you've been just speaking about.

MS. FARKAS: So if we can play the chorus of "Thinking Out Loud" starting at 1:11 to about 1:42.

(Audio playing)

A. You're hearing the I/3, IV, V chord progression here. This is the — you'll hear three iterations of it. If we could start that again.

(Audio playing)

A. This is the chord progression at issue.

(Audio playing)

that descending (playing).

- Q. So can you just explain to us briefly what we just heard.
- A. Yes. And so once again, we heard three iterations of the basic chord progression at issue (playing piano). And now since we heard them with anticipation, I should play it that way. So we heard (playing). We hear that three times and then followed by bars 9 and 10, or measures 9 and 10, and we heard

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- 1 Let's discuss the harmonic rhythm in more detail. What is 2 harmonic rhythm?
  - A. Harmonic rhythm is the rate of change of chords, rate or pace of change of chords.
    - Q. Is the harmonic rhythm in "Let's Get It On" the same as the harmonic rhythm in "Thinking Out Loud"?
      - It is not. Α.
    - Dr. Stewart testified that when the tempo of "Let's Get It On" is adjusted, the harmonic rhythm is identical to "Thinking Out Loud." Do you agree with him?
    - Following the Harvard Dictionary of Music definition of "harmonic rhythm," you'll see in the beginning of the second paragraph, harmonic rhythm does not itself depend on tempo, in fact, any more than melodic rhythm does. So whether you play a song fast or slow, the relationships in the duration of those chords remain. If a chord is held for three beats and then it changes, it's still three beats and a change, whether you play it fast or whether you play it slow. And that's what that means in the Harvard Dictionary of Music.
      - Q. And is there even a tempo notated in the deposit copy of "Let's Get It On"?
  - A. No, of course not. As I mentioned earlier, there is no tempo marked in the LGO deposit copy.
- 24 Q. Let's discuss the alleged similarity with respect to 25 harmonic rhythm.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

22

23

24

25

What has Dr. Stewart claimed is similar?

- In addition to the chord progression, he finds that both Α. and this is correct — that both chord progressions feature anticipation, where the chord comes in ahead of the beat, and specifically, the anticipation of the second and the fourth
- 7 Is it possible to perform a chord progression without harmonic rhythm?

chord in each of the chord progressions.

- A. No. As soon as the chord progression is performed or if it is written over a staff and there's actually beats, then the chord progression includes the harmonic rhythm.
- Can you please play for us the chords of "Thinking Out Loud" at issue with anticipation and then play it without anticipation and then please repeat that.
- Okay. So here is with anticipation. Two, three, four Α. (playing). Without: (playing).
- 17 Can you repeat that, please. 0.
- A. Yes, I'll do it again. Here is with anticipation. 18 19 three, four (playing). Without: (playing).
- 20 Q. And what is your understanding of Dr. Stewart's opinion 21 regarding the significance of anticipation in this case?
  - It's a linchpin for Dr. Stewart's finding that this combination is significant. Once again, the chord progressions are not the same, but they are — the anticipation on the second and fourth is. The problem with that opinion is

N521GRI1

twofold:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

First, anticipation in and of itself. Anticipation is a centuries-old device. It is a musical building block.

Ferrara - Direct

And secondly, the fact that it happens to be used in a second and fourth chord of a four-chord progression is also common, and indeed, as I'll show later, there are even some songs that predate "Let's Get It On" that have that chord progression with that harmonic rhythm.

- Q. And do you recall what Dr. Stewart said at his deposition about, you know, if there were no anticipation in this case?
- I attended Dr. Stewart's deposition years ago, by telephone, so I listened in, and certainly had a transcript of his deposition, and it is my recollection — and it certainly has come up since — that Dr. Stewart conceded that the chord progression in and of itself was commonplace.
- Q. And do you recall that he admitted that without anticipation, the similar chord progression would not suggest copying?

Objection, your Honor. He can't testify MR. FRANK: as to what Dr. Stewart said in his deposition. That's hearsay. If they want to put up Dr. Stewart's deposition, they can certainly do that. But this is completely inappropriate to elicit testimony from this witness about what another expert said.

MS. FARKAS: He's responding to their expert's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

testimony about — and concessions about what's at issue in this case and what's not.

THE COURT: Not offered for the truth. It's offered for the fact there were utterances by the other speaker.

Overruled.

- A. Could you repeat the question.
- Q. I'll try.

Do you recall that at Dr. Stewart's deposition he admitted that without anticipation, the similar chord progressions at issue would not suggest copying?

- A. Yes.
- Q. I'd like you to take a look at what's been marked for identification as Defendant's Exhibit 204.
- Do you recognize this document?
  - A. I do. The first page is the book cover of a method book for guitarists, chord progressions, chord progressions for guitarists, and that is followed by three pages of contents from the book.
  - MS. FARKAS: I'd like to move Exhibit 204 into evidence.
- 21 MR. FRANK: No objection, your Honor.
- 22 THE COURT: Received.
- 23 (Defendant's Exhibit 204 received in evidence)
- Q. Generally speaking, what is being taught in these excerpts from the guitar method book?

- A. In Chapter 1, you can actually see it in the text at the top, it says a 2-bar strumming pattern. Strumming is the strum pattern of the guitarist. That anticipates the chord changes in measures 2, 4, 6, 8. So this is essentially teaching anticipation to guitar students.
- Q. And are there other examples in this book that you'd like to point out?
- A. Yes. So if you look at example 5, the first chord is on the beat, which is like the chord progression in LGO; the second chord anticipates that is, comes right before the next bar, like LGO; the third chord is on the beat; and once again, the fourth chord anticipates the next bar. So essentially this is showing, not using the same chords these are not the chords in LGO, but these are showing anticipation of not just chords but of the second and the fourth chords.

On the next page in the slide, which is page 17, we have to go — let's see. Yes. Go down to 27. That's the example in the middle. And you can see that it's the same — that is, the A7 chord is on the beat; the E minor chord anticipates the downbeat; the third chord A7 is on the beat. And so once again, it's showing anticipation in the second and fourth chords. And once again, this is not the chord progression at issue; this is just showing anticipation of second and fourth chords.

Q. And is there another example you'd like to just walk us

1 through?

- 2 A. Yes. And this is 98. Here, we see the first chord on the
- 3 | beat. This is like TOL. So the second chord anticipates the
- 4 | third beat of the first bar, not the next bar, which is what we
- 5 | have in LGO; but the second chord once again is anticipated;
- 6 the third chord is on the beat; the fourth chord is
- 7 anticipated. Once again, this simply shows anticipation of the
- 8 second and fourth chords, in this case in a guitar method book.
- 9 Q. And what is the significance of this being of these
- 10 | examples of anticipation being in this guitar method book?
- 11 | A. It underlines the commonplace nature of something that any
- 12 | musicologist knows, and that is that anticipation is centuries
- 13 | old, it's a musical building block, and indeed it is
- 14 commonplace in popular music, not only to use it but to use it
- 15  $\parallel$  specifically with respect to the second and fourth chords.
- 16 Q. I'd like you to take a look at what's been marked for
- 17 | identification as Defendant's Exhibit 212.
- Do you recognize this document?
- 19 A. Yes, I do.
- 20 | O. And what is this document?
- 21  $\parallel$  A. This is published sheet music of songs that in some
- 22 cases predate LGO, in others postdate that I have selected
- 23 because they, once again, have a chord progression that has
- 24 anticipation of the second and fourth chords.
- MS. FARKAS: We'd like to move Exhibit 212 into

1 evidence.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. FRANK: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Received.

(Defendant's Exhibit 212 received in evidence)

- Q. What songs are included in Defendant's 212?
- A. "People Get Ready," and that was released in 1964 by Curtis Mayfield.

If we could move through.

"Lo and Behold," that was released by James Taylor in 1970.

So both of these first two predate LGO. We can move again.

"Billie Jean," which most of you probably know, by Michael Jackson. That was released in 1983. That would be post-LGO but many years before TOL.

And next, "Learning to Fly" by Tom Petty. And that was released in 1991. That, once again, is post-LGO but many years before TOL.

And finally, "Should've Been a Cowboy." And that was released in I think 1993. It's rather small. And that's by Toby Keith.

- Q. Now I thought you had said that anticipation was common.
- 23 Why are we only looking at five songs in this exhibit?
- 24 A. This is illustrative. This is just a small sample of what
- 25 could have been many, many songs that use, once again, a -

1 | h

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- have a four-chord progression in which the second and fourth chords are anticipated. None of these five songs have the chord progression at issue.
- Q. Could you briefly demonstrate "People Get Ready" on the piano for the jury, please.
- A. Yes. The chord progression in "People Get Ready" is this. So one, two, three, four . . . (playing). So I put the melody now in the introduction. I think you'll recognize it. It actually is recorded this way (playing). So what you just heard was the first chord on the beat (playing), the second chord anticipated (playing), third chord on the beat (playing),

the fourth chord anticipated (playing). So, (playing).

And let's just think about, for the moment, what we're talking about. In the examples that I gave in the — in the method book, but particularly here, we're talking about this:

Two, three, four . . . (clapping). That's it. (Clapping)

That's all there is. That's the anticipation. That is the harmonic rhythm.

- Q. The second song, "Lo and Behold," when was that released in relation to "Let's Get It On"?
- A. Okay. So once again, I'll play with the introduction.

  This continues, as it does in the previous song, into the

  verse. But here's the introduction. It's in the key of C. So

  (playing). What we just heard was one, two, three, four, one,

  two, three, four (playing), (clapping). That's it. That's the

- 1 | anticipation that's at issue.
- Q. And do you know when that song was released as compared to "Let's Get It On"?
- 4 A. Yes. Three years prior to "Let's Get It On," by James
  5 Taylor.
- 6 | Q. Let's do one more. When was "Learning to Fly" released?
- 7 A. Okay. "Learning to Fly," here's the intro. And actually,
- 8 you can hear that clapped rhythm I just played because those
- 9 are the notes. So, one, two, three, four (playing). And that
- 10 chord progression continues with the vocal, as in the others,
- 11 | when the vocal comes in, "Well, I started out down a dirty
- 12 | road" (playing). So the continuation, that is the anticipation
- 13 | that's at issue.
- 14 | Q. And was that song released before "Thinking Out Loud"?
- 15 A. This was released before "Thinking Out Loud." I can see it
- 16 more clearly here. 1991.
- 17 | Q. Have you found examples of songs that feature the
- 18 anticipated second and fourth chords that also use the same
- 19 | chord progressions that are at issue in this case?
- 20 | A. Yes, I did.
- 21 | Q. I'd like to direct your attention to the testimony of Ed
- 22 | Sheeran using anticipation in prior songs. What specifically
- 23 | did you find?

- 24 A. I'm sorry. What song?
  - Q. About Ed Sheeran using anticipation in prior songs.

the fourth chords.

harmonic rhythm.

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Ferrara - Direct

- Oh, in prior songs. I'm sorry. I reviewed songs that Ed 1 Sheeran either wrote or co-wrote, and in all cases recorded, 2 3 prior to TOL. In fact, the years, as I recall, was between 2005 and 2013, and what I discovered — or even 2012 — what I 4 5 discovered was 20 songs of — that are part of Ed Sheeran's 6 repertoire, that he co-wrote or wrote, that include 7 anticipation. And notably, of those 20 songs that include 8 anticipation, 10 of them have anticipation of the second and
- 10 And can you explain how you made those findings.
  - Yes. Once again, I went through sheet music and audio particularly of the Ed Sheeran songs, and using the same methodology that I mentioned before — it's slow and deliberate, I made certain that I was accurate in the analysis — and in so doing, I discovered that at least 10 of his songs prior to TOL include this second and fourth anticipation
  - Q. And when you were reviewing Ed Sheeran's prior songs and you found a song that used anticipation, did you record or write down your findings?
  - Yes, I did. I created a list. Α.
- 22 Can you please take a look at what's been marked for 23 identification as Defendant's Exhibit 214.
- 24 That is the list that I created of the 20 songs, and 25 as you can see, some of the songs have —

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

701

- 1 Q. Hold on. Sorry.
  - A. Oh, I'm sorry, once again.
- 3 Q. Got to do it the right way.

MS. FARKAS: I'd like to move Exhibit 214 into evidence.

MR. FRANK: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Received.

(Defendant's Exhibit 214 received in evidence)

- Q. Proceed.
- A. Okay. I jumped the gun again. All right.

As you can see, what this includes, in the parentheticals — there are ten of them. Starting with the first one, "I Love You," the second and the fourth chord are anticipated, and so if you — as you scroll down, you'll see

this occurs, parentheses, in 10 of the 20 songs.

- Q. And from a musicological perspective, what is the significance, if any, of Mr. Sheeran's use of anticipation in his prior songs?
- A. Well, first, anticipation itself is clearly part of the vocabulary, an important part of the vocabulary of Ed Sheeran; and in addition to that, anticipating the second and fourth chords as well as anticipation of chords in and of themselves is part of his toolbox. It is part of his repertoire. It's what he does, and he did frequently prior to TOL.
- Q. So would it be safe to say that you find this list of songs

significant?

that.

- A. Yes, this would be very significant, because once again, it underlines the fact that what Ed Sheeran wrote and created in TOL was growing out of the corpus of his works that predated
  - Q. Dr. Ferrara, is the harmonic rhythm in "Let's Get It On" and "Thinking Out Loud" the same?
  - A. No, it is not.
  - Q. Would you like we're going to go through a slide that will hopefully help you illustrate it for the jury. I direct your attention to the screen.

Can you tell us what we're looking at, Dr. Ferrara.

A. Yes. These are charts that I created to show the harmonic rhythm in LGO, which is here — and I'll explain it in a moment — and TOL, which is here. I did the same — for anyone who didn't want to see it over musical staffs, I did it with boxes. So these bottom two boxes merely replicate the staffs on top.

And so if we stay with the staffs on top, you can see that in LGO, there is a I chord. That's the one chord we already know about. These markings are rests, just to say that we're not putting any vocal melody here, we're just talking about the chords. And those rests allow us to calibrate the number of beats that each of these chords has as a duration. So the first chord, the I chord, has three beats. Duration is three beats. The iii chord comes in on the fourth beat of the

bar. Call it the measure; it's the same.

And after the bar line, we have the second measure.

And what's important to note is that this iii chord continues.

It doesn't just play for this one beat, the fourth beat of the first bar; it continues all the way through the next bar, until the next chord change. That iii chord is five beats.

Then the IV chord comes in for three beats, then the V chord comes in. Just like the iii chord, it starts at the end of the third bar and continues in the fourth bar for five beats.

You can see that they don't line up, and the reason they don't is that in TOL, the first chord is one and a half beats, not three; the second chord is two and a half beats, not five; and so forth with IV and V.

And there's a very important point here. Dr. Stewart cuts in half the value of the chords in the harmonic progression. He cuts them in half. And later I'll show you that that can be done. It could be done to facilitate a comparative analysis. But what's important here is that this is what's in the deposit copy. We cannot say that this chord progression or the harmonic rhythm in TOL is the same as LGO. It is not. You can see that it is not. This is an important point with respect to key. Because I've already testified that the two songs are in different keys. One's E flat, one's D. But to facilitate the comparison, we put them both in D. But

N521GRI1

Ferrara - Direct

we never say, and therefore, "Let's Get It On" is in the key of D. We always say, with the qualification, we're transposing it to D, but by the way, it is in the key of E flat. So even if you transpose, it doesn't make the two songs in the same key. That's just a facilitation of the analysis. It is exactly the same here. Yes, a musicologist — and I do this later with prior art — will cut that note value and chord value in half. We do that so that things line up. But the key is, you can't then come back and say, oh, now they're the same. You can't now come back, after you halved the chord progressions, and say they're the same. That would be like saying, oh, since I transposed, well, "Let's Get It On" into the key of D, now it's in the key of D, it isn't in the key of E flat. Well, no, the deposit copy is in the key of E flat, and it's different. It's exactly the same idea. It's analogous.

And so no matter what you do, these two remain different in harmonic rhythm.

- Q. So I'd like to direct your attention to the screen now.

  Can you just walk us through quickly what the differences are that you identified with respect to the harmonic rhythm in each work.
- A. Yes. And as you can see and I've already testified to much of this the first difference is the I chord in LGO has a duration of three beats. You go to the right, the I chord has a duration of 1.5 beats in TOL.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

1819

20

21

22

23

24

25

No. 2. The iii chord, which is the second chord of the progression, has a duration of five beats in LGO; the I/3 chord, which is the second chord in the progression in TOL, has a duration of 2.5 beats.

No. 3. As a difference, the IV chord in LGO has a duration of three beats, the IV chord in TOL has a duration of 1.5 beats.

The fourth, the fourth and final chord in LGO, in this four-chord progression, the V chord has a duration of five beats. The V chord in TOL has a duration of 2.5 beats.

And a fifth difference — and there are many others, by the way — is that the duration of the anticipated chord is a quarter note in LGO, but it is half that — the anticipated chord in TOL is an eighth note in duration.

Those are just five of many other differences in the chord progressions as recorded and written by Ed Sheeran in TOL and as written in the deposit copy of LGO.

Q. Dr. Ferrara, I want to direct your attention to Dr. Stewart's trial testimony.

Do you recall his testimony that your analysis of the harmonic rhythm in "Let's Get It On" implies six chords in the deposit copy?

- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. And I direct your attention to Dr. Stewart's slide 38.
- What are we looking at here?

A. This is an excerpt of I believe this is my declaration.

It's paragraph 28. So what you're seeing in the body is after

— after the No. 28, paragraph 28, is a direct excerpt from

that report. And what it suggests is that somehow I created a

six-chord progression in — in LGO, which is farcical.

I'll just give you one example. In the second sentence, the harmonic rhythm in the four-bar chord progression is two chords in bar 1 — no one disputes that — one chord in bar 2. And if we could go back to that previous chart so that I can just show you, so — the previous one before that. I'm sorry. That's it.

So this is what I was talking about. So here, the iii chord. It's the second chord in bar 1. The iii chord doesn't end there. It continues. It's five beats. How many chords are there in bar 2? One. It's the continuation of the second chord from the first bar.

He does the same thing — that is, Dr. Stewart does the same thing, and it's farcical — by suggesting that by me saying that in bar 3 there are two chords — there are, we agree — and in bar 4 there's only one chord, of course there's only one chord. It's the V chord that continues. That doesn't create six chords. It's simply showing that the duration of the third and fifth chords and the V chords, the iii and the V chords, continue into the next bar.

Q. At any point during this case have you ever stated that

- there are six, not four chords in the chord progression in

  Let's Get It On"?
- 3 | A. No.

6

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

- Q. Okay. Let's discuss the melodies in a little more detail now.
  - In your own analysis of the melodies in "Let's Get It On," did you rely upon the deposit copy?
- 8 A. Yes, I did.
- 9 Q. And regarding "Thinking Out Loud," how did you analyze the melodies?
  - A. I analyzed the melodies by of course referring to the sound recording but using the transcriptions that we discussed before of the melodies and the chord progressions.
    - Q. Could you please take a look at what's been marked for identification as Defendant's Exhibit 238.
    - Do you recognize this document?
- 17 A. 238.
  - Yes. This is my transcription of the opening melody in LGO and the open opening melody in TOL, and the reason it says Melody A is because up until recently I did it again.
- 21 Three times is a charm. Hopefully this will be the last.
- 22 | Q. I raised a finger trying to warn you.
- MS. FARKAS: Your Honor, we'd like to move Exhibit 238 into evidence.
- MR. FRANK: No objection, your Honor.

1 THE COURT: Received.

(Defendant's Exhibit 238 received in evidence)

- A. All right. I will continue with my --
- 4 Q. Are your transcriptions of the melodies in "Let's Get It
- 5 On" consistent with the deposit copy?
- 6 A. Yes.

2

- 7 Q. Okay. Do you want to just briefly describe to us what this
- 8 exhibit is.
- 9 A. Yes. The the exhibit is a collection of my
- 10 transcriptions of the melodies that were placed in issue, and
- 11 | they continue beyond Melody A.
- 12 Melody A is the opening melody of both works, and in
- 13 previous reports of Dr. Stewart, he referred to this as Melody
- 14 A., and so that is why since he has put the melody at issue,
- 15 | I'm just using his terminology.
- The next is Melody B, which we'll be getting to, and
- 17 | finally, Melody C. These are my transcriptions of the portions
- 18 at issue in those melodies.
- 19 Q. And are your transcriptions of the melodies placed in issue
- 20 | in "Thinking Out Loud" consistent with the published sheet
- 21 | music of "Thinking Out Loud"?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 MS. FARKAS: If we could go to slide 13, Scott,
- 24 please.
- 25 | Q. Can you please take a look at what's on the screen and let

us know what we are looking at. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- This is my transcription of Melody A, and the top staff is Α. the transcription just as it appears in the "Let's Get It On" deposit copy. On the bottom is the opening — the corresponding opening melody and lyric to TOL.
- And what has been added to the screen? Ο.
- In the second comparative transcription, I have in LGO cut in half the note values so that they align to facilitate the comparison. So if something — if there is a note — for example, here, this is an eighth note, the first note, sung to "I've." This is the same note sung to "I've," but now it's a 16th. Everything is cut in half.
- Q. And what effect, if any, does cutting the note values in half have?
- A. You could probably see that just in terms of the expanse of the melodic phrase, that this is much — the cutting in half is much more compact. The reason musicologists do this is to facilitate the comparison. In so doing, you end up erasing some of the differences; for example, the differences in metric placement, where on the beat or within the beat a note occurs, you give that up. The point, though, is that even erasing some of those differences in rhythmic durations and in metric placements, this melody cut in half, in LGO, and this melody both the opening melodies in LGO and TOL, are so dramatically different that it doesn't matter that you cut it in half and

- lose some of those differences.
- 2 Q. Now we're looking at Melody A here. Did you also have the
- 3 | notes in the other "Let's Get It On" melodies that Dr. Stewart
- 4 has placed in issue?
- 5 | A. Yes.

8

- Q. So let's stick with Melody A for now, which is the opening melodies in each song.
  - At a high level, what, if anything, did you find with respect to the so-called Melody A in each song?
- 10 A. They're dramatically different. The the pitch sequence
- 11 you saw some of that pitch sequence analysis with
- 12 Dr. Stewart is clearly different, and I will show that. The
- 13 | rhythmic durations of the notes are dramatically different.
- 14 | The metrical placements of corresponding notes are different.
- 15 | They're simply two very different melodies.
- 16 Q. And are there any musicologically significant similarities
- 17 | between these two melodies?
- 18 A. There are none.
- 19 Q. Could you please play Melody A in each work at the piano,
- 20 consistent with your transcriptions.
- 21 MS. FARKAS: I think, Scott, if we could go to slide
- 22 | 14.
- 23 | Q. Unless you're comfortable with this one.
- 24 A. Yes. So I'll beat out, in eighth beats, one, and two, and
- 25 | (playing). That's LGO. I'll play it again. One and two and

(playing).

J

Here is TOL. One and two and — sorry. One and two (playing).

And now one after the other without interruption. LGO (playing).

Q. Thank you. Let's move on to slide 15.

Can you please identify for us what has now been projected on the screen.

- A. Yes. In the top projection, you can see that above each of the notes, I wrote the scale degree. The scale degree simply identifies where on the scale each pitch occurs. So if there's a 3, it means that this is on scale degree 3 in a D major scale. (Playing). It's that note. And I have then trans—transposed those scale degree numbers above each of the notes in the chart at the bottom. And you saw similar charts with Dr. Stewart. That matches them literally, just in the order that they occur. And wherever they match, the same pitch, the same scale degree, I highlighted it in green. So there are 14 pitches in the LGO Melody A. As you can see, they match up with three in the Melody A in TOL.
- Q. Now I just want to direct your attention to where your chart of scale degrees, some of the 3s have what looks like a lower case b in front of it. Can you explain what that is.
- A. Yes. Part of the modality we'll talk about modal quality later. Part of the modality in LGO absent in the vocal

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

24

25

melody of TOL is that there are in fact about a dozen, in the overall deposit copy, examples of scale degree 3, which is F sharp (playing), third scale degree of the (playing). That's called the diatonic scale (playing). This note, this is the flat 3 (playing). And that small b means flat. So flat 3 (playing). That is not part of the diatonic scale. And it is often referred to as a blue note — that is, when the scale degree 3 is not in this case F sharp (playing) but it's F natural (playing). These are different pitches (playing). 3, flat 3 (playing).

- Q. Is it musically significant for two songs to share some pitches here and there?
- A. No. As everyone knows, there are seven pitches in a musical scale, and even adding the flat 3 would make eight pitches, so it would not be unusual for two works to share some pitches in order.
- Q. And if we look at the pitches that do line up, are they consecutive?
- 19 A. No. They're scattered. They're fragmentary.
- Q. And we've been discussing the pitch sequences for Melody A
  in "Let's Get It On" and "Thinking Out Loud," meaning the order
  of the pitches in each melody. Is what we are looking at on
  these chart of scale degrees, is this melody?
  - A. No. And by the way, the Xs are x'g out all of the scale degrees, all of the pitches that are out of sequence. The only

II NSZIGRII

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ones that are not X'd out are those pitches or scale degrees that align. So the first 3/3 and so forth.

So go ahead with that question?

- Q. I was asking if pitches are melody.
- A. Ah, whether pitches are melody. Pitches are a part of melody, but alone they are not. A pitch is a melodic tone, without duration, a melodic tone without duration.
- 8 Q. And what is a note?
- 9 A. A note is a pitch with duration. It's a dramatic difference.
  - Q. In addition to pitch sequences, do you have an opinion on whether, in assessing melodic similarities and differences, it is important to also include an analysis of the rhythmic durations and metric placements of those pitches?
    - A. Of course. You cannot do a proper musicological analysis of melody without not only looking at the pitch sequence but also doing an analysis of the of the melodic rhythms, and that melodic rhythms include the rhythmic duration of each pitch and the metric placement, where it falls in the bar.
    - Q. Dr. Ferrara, I'd like to draw your attention to what's been projected on the screen.

Do you recognize that?

- A. Oh, yes. This this is a definition that Dr. Stewart gave of "melody" in a previous case.
  - Q. And in his definition, Dr. Stewart states that, "Along with

N521GRI1 Ferrara - Direct

pitch, duration (rhythm) is an essential element in the formation and recognition of melodies. While we may separate these elements for the purposes of analysis, it is essential to remember that both are the defining characteristics of melod[ies] . . ."

- A. Yes, I agree with that, that I think he he has essentially the content of both the Harvard and Oxford dictionaries of music, and that essentially says that it's not just pitched sounds, it's pitched sounds in musical time, which means rhythmic durations, and measured time, which means they're in bars, and we have to — is this on beat three, is this on beat four, is this a quarter note, is this a half note? That is, as — as he has said, an essential element in the formation and recognition of melodies, and part of any proper musicological analysis.
- Q. So at the risk of asking I'll just ask the question.

Did you analyze the rhythmic durations and metric placements of Melody A in both songs?

19 Α. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- 20 And did Dr. Stewart analyze the rhythmic durations and 21 metric placements in Melody A of both songs?
- 22 Α. No.
- 23 Is that proper musicological procedure? 0.
- 24 It is not proper musicological procedure. Α.
- 25 So did Dr. Stewart actually analyze the melody in each Q.

song?

A. He only analyzed the pitch. And once again, that's the difference in the definition between a pitch and a note. He didn't analyze the notes in the melody because he never got to rhythmic duration. He only analyzed the pitches, which is part of the contour. The contour also follows the pitches, up and down, but it doesn't tell us how long each note, the duration of each note, where it falls into the bar. That's what makes a melody.

Let me just give an example. Here is a — a melody that — that you might find well known (playing). What distinguishes that melody — which is only eight descending notes, scale degrees 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 — what distinguishes it — ba, ba, ba, ba, ba, ba, ba, that's the rhythmic duration. That's the rhythmic duration. That's what's distinctive. That it's just 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 is a musical building block. That's been left out of Dr. Stewart's analysis.

- Q. Looking at what's projected on the screen, if you could use your pointer and explain your findings regarding rhythmic durations and metric placements in Melody A.
- A. Well, first, let me say that I could spend a lot of time on this. But just in terms of the metrical placement, the obviously, the first note here does not line up with the first note; the second note here does not line up with the second

note there. So the metrical placements within beats are different.

But also, look at — for example, the first note is, on scale degree 3 — here is the first note on scale degree 3, but here, it comes in a 16th beat later in the bar and it is tied over, it's held over, so in fact the rhythmic duration of this note is an eighth. The rhythmic duration of this 3 is a 16th.

And if we go through, this continues through. And you can see also that these notes are all off the beat. So the first three notes, "I've been real," even — let's just do the first two. "I've been." "I've been." (Playing). So, two and (playing). It's off the beat. Two and (playing). I'll do it this way. They're off the beat. Whereas (playing) these are on the beat within beats one and — and eighth notes.

If you listen to the rhythm of just the first part of the LGO melody, "I've been really try," just that first part, here's the beat. And two and (playing), as compared with (playing). And then the next, (playing). That was the next bar (playing), in LGO as compared with (playing). That's a dramatic difference in the rhythmic duration.

But what's also different, and not pointed out in the analysis of Dr. Stewart, is the extraordinary difference within each of these. And that is, first, all of these notes in LGO move, one to the next, in stepwise order. That means they all

move to the next adjacent key on a piano or the next adjacent number. 3, 4, 5, 4, 3, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2. Leaving out the flats because they're all adjacent, all stepwise. That's not the case here. From the 3 to the 5, we skipped 4. That's called a leap. From this 5 to this 3, we skipped 4 again.

And here, we really are different in TOL as compared to LGO. Here we have 2b. That is an interval, a space, of a perfect fifth. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. That's seven half-steps away. Whereas in LGO, all of the notes are stepwise, and then we have another leap. So this is another difference.

But there's also a very important modal difference.

If you listen (playing) to that opening melody in TOL, they're all diatonic. They're all part of the D scale. But very specifically, they all use five of those seven notes. Five of them. And that's called pentatonic. Everybody knows what "penta" means. "Penta" just means five, five tones. It's these five tones (playing). That's the pentatonic part of the diatonic scale (playing).

Now you may recognize that because in fact, for centuries, traditional Chinese music has been heavily using the pentatonic scale. It's also very popular in popular music.

That is the modality of the opening melodic phrases in TOL (playing). Now let's compare that to what is going on in LGO (playing). Blue note (playing); blue note (playing); blue note (playing). Those blue notes are gorgeous. I love them.

notes in Melody A.

Beautiful writing by Mr. Townsend. But they are different, they're very different, from (playing), from that.

Put all of that together, and these are dramatically different melodies, from any perspective.

- Q. Dr. Ferrara, if we were to look at the slide that's on the screen, can you explain to us what the red marks indicate.
- A. Yes. If one were to compare the melody, the opening melody in LGO as it is written in the deposit copy and the TOL transcription and by the way, the only difference in Dr. Stewart's transcription and mine is that additional grace note in his. But if you were to to X out every corresponding note that is not the same pitch, one; two, not the same rhythmic duration; and three, not the same metric placement this is an analysis I've done for more than 30 years, not just in popular music but before that in other music before litigation, that is, I should say using that benchmark, there's literally nothing left. The melody disappears because they're so different. Nothing lines up.

  Q. I'd like to read you some of Dr. Stewart's testimony from last week when I asked him about the rhythmic duration of the
  - "Q. You have to divide it to be the same?"
- "A. The difference here you're talking about is so minuscule in terms of the rhythmic duration that I think it is completely insignificant."

f **138** 719

"Q. Okay. But they are different, correct?"

"A. Notationally it looks different but it's not. We're talking about hundredths of a second in terms of duration."

Do you agree with Dr. Stewart's opinion?

A. No. I strongly disagree. I think it's an absurd opinion.

The idea that you omit notes because they're fast in a musical score is ludicrous. It's in the score; you analyze it. It's uncomfortable, perhaps, for Dr. Stewart that these notes that one would omit are notes of difference, and so he will say these differences are insignificant, but in doing a proper musicological analysis, you study all of the notes, and in so doing, you find that they're all x'd out. So I strongly disagree with that.

Indeed, let's think about the — the problem with that. Every work that is fast, you'd say, well, the fast notes we're going to leave out, because it's only a hundredth of a second. We're just going to deal with the slow notes. We'll have all these big gaps. We'll forget this section because it's fast, we'll do this section because it's slow. It's an absolutely absurd musicological position.

Q. Dr. Ferrara, I'd like to direct your attention to Stewart slide 65.

And I want to draw your attention to the portion of "Thinking Out Loud" that he presented to the Court last week.

5

720

1 Does this reflect all of the lyrics from "Thinking Out Loud"?

- A. I believe —
- 3  $\parallel$  Q. If I direct your attention —
- 4 A. I believe the word "from" is missing.
  - Q. And can you indicate where that is.
- 6 A. Yes. If you look at the bottom line, "Will your eyes still
- 7 | smile, "what's written is, "Will your eyes still smile your
- 8 | cheeks?" It's actually, "Will your eyes still smile from your
- 9 cheeks?"
- 10 | Q. And the notes that are colored in blue, has he changed the
- 11 | notes of the melody of "Thinking Out Loud"?
- 12 A. Yes. Dr. Stewart changed scale degree 3 with a blue note,
- 13 and it's also called the blue third, the flat 3, and so instead
- of the note F sharp (playing), he's substituted it with
- 15 | (playing) that.
- 16 Q. Dr. Ferrara, focusing on this opening melody of "Thinking
- 17 | Out Loud, " has Mr. Sheeran used a similar melodic sequence in
- 18 | any of his prior songs?
- 19 | A. Of this. Well, I'd just like to to perhaps play the
- 20 | first two phrases in that slide that you have up.
- 21 Q. Okay.
- 22 | A. So here, let's first hear what Ed Sheeran actually wrote
- $23 \parallel (playing)$ .
- 24 And this is what Dr. Stewart's written (playing).
- 25 That is simply not what Ed Sheeran wrote. I don't

N521GRI1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ferrara - Direct

know what the purpose of the exercise is, but it dramatically 1 2 changes not only the note but the character. It changes what? It changes the modality (playing). 3

- So Dr. Ferrara, focusing on this, the first line that we 0. see up here, when it's actually accurately —
  - MS. FARKAS: Let's take this down.
- So focusing on the opening melody of "Thinking Out Loud," has Mr. Sheeran used a similar melodic sequence in a prior song?
- Yes, certainly, yeah. Α.
- And do you know what song that is?
- You'll have to help me with the title again because I'm just analyzing the music and not the —
- 14 Does "The A Team" sound familiar? Q.
  - Α. "The A Team." Of course. My bad.

In the chorus, in each chorus, there is a very similar melody that not only has pitches but it also has some similarity in the melodic rhythm, but using, for example since this is the bar that's been set, using Dr. Stewart's standard, are there pitches, is there a sequence of pitches in the chorus of "The A Team" that is similar to the opening melody in TOL, the answer is a resounding yes, and much more than anything that Dr. Stewart suggested was similar in the two songs at issue.

Are you able to play those melodies for us at the piano?

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. Yes. So it would be (playing). This is the first seven pitches. I'm going to stop there. It continues. And there

3 are continued similarities. But there's an extra note in

between. But listen to that (playing). That's what — the

rhythm that it's sung. So Ed Sheeran sings this in each chord.

So take "The A Team," and that I believe is 2011, about three years before TOL.

So here are the — here's the melody (playing).

Here's the opening of "Let's Get It On" (playing). Okay. So

(playing), as compared with (playing). Seven identical pitches in sequence.

- Q. Dr. Ferrara, you just said that you were playing the opening melody from "Let's Get It On," but I think you meant "Thinking Out Loud," correct?
- 15 A. Did I say "Let's Get It On"?
- 16 | Q. You did.
  - A. I'm just going in the flow. Yes, it should have been that's my bad. It should have been "Thinking Out Loud." so "Thinking Out Loud" (playing). "The A Team" (playing).

"A Team" (playing). "Thinking Out Loud." Seven identical pitches in a row. There was nothing remotely as similar between any of the melodies that Dr. Stewart put in issue than this similarity between a work that Ed Sheeran wrote in 2011 and "Thinking Out Loud."

Q. I'd like to direct your attention to what's being projected

on the screen.

Can you please explain what we're looking at and the significance of this slide, if any, to your analysis.

A. This is a transcription — the top is — it's from the publication — if I can get this to work.

All right. Well, the top line is the — the melody as it is — there it is. This is the melody as it is in the — in the library collection. I have now transposed it to the key of D and down an octave, and here I've created a comparative transcription. This is "Espressivo," from Variations. This is written by Francesco Pollini, who obviously died in 1846, and I red highlighted the notes that have the same pitches. This is essentially what Dr. Stewart did in his comparative analyses. And as you can see, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, the same seven notes that — the same seven pitches that I just pointed out in "The A Team," 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.

- Q. Dr. Ferrara, have you also completed a combined analysis of the chords and the melodies in what Dr. Stewart labels Melody A in "Let's Get It On" and "Thinking Out Loud"?
- A. Yes. So you can see that this is essentially the same comparative transcription with LGO opening melody and TOL opening melody, one on top, one on bottom, but now, in addition to the notes, I've added the chord symbols. And let me mention that the chord symbols are based on what chords are actually sounding in TOL at that moment. So these are not the basic

chords. This is what's actually sounding. But I'm going to actually play the basic chords for you, and that will cut out some of the difference. So I'm going to make the chords less different between TOL and LGO. The key is the chord context with the melody. Dr. Stewart suggested that in addition to the combination of this common chord progression and the common use of anticipation, in addition to that, we also had a melody overlaying it. Well, we now know the status of those melodies and how different they are. But the point is he made the point, and one of the things that made the melodies more alike is the fact that they have a chord progression that's going that's very similar, at least.

I'm going to play the melody that you can see with the F sharp minor chord, "I've really been try." So here's that melody (playing). And here it is with the chord (playing). Again (playing). So we've contextualized the melody with the harmony (playing).

I'm going to do the same thing now within that box of don't — "When your legs don't work like they," under the D/F sharp (playing). LGO (playing). TOL (playing).

I don't find any help with the chords in making the melodies sound more alike. This is even more dramatic now in the last bar, the second half of the phrase, as you can see, under the next chord, the G chord. And so here's a G chord under the notes in the melody of LGO (playing). Again

24

25

(playing). And here it is in L — TOL (playing). The chords 1 don't help. The melodies are still dramatically different. 2 3 And finally, with respect to the fourth chord, while there are two notes under the A chord (playing), "Baby," there 4 5 are no melody notes under the A chord in TOL. 6 Q. In conclusion, Dr. Ferrara, do you find any musicological 7 evidence that Melody A in "Thinking Out Loud" was copied from Melody A in "Let's Get It On"? 8 There's absolutely no remote evidence of copying, let alone 9 10 similarity. 11 Q. And in fact, did Dr. Stewart even analyze the melody in 12 what he called Melody A? 13 A. By disregarding what is defined as notes and only dealing 14 with pitches, he failed; he failed by omission to analyze the 15 melodies at issue. MS. FARKAS: Your Honor, I think we're at a good 16 17 breaking point. We're about to move on to the next melodic 18 portion. So if it's okay with your Honor, we'd like to break for lunch? 19 20 THE COURT: We'll resume at 2:15. 21 THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise. 22 (Luncheon recess) 23

25

No.

Α.

## 1 AFTERNOON SESSION 2 2:25 p.m. 3 (Trial resumed; jury present) 4 LAWRENCE FERRARA, resumed. BY MS. FARKAS: 5 Good afternoon, Dr. Ferrara. 6 7 A. Good afternoon. Q. Let's move on to the second set of melodies that 8 9 Dr. Stewart has placed in issue, a portion of the melody in 10 "Let's Get It On" at the end of verse four and into the 11 beginning of chorus two as compared to a melody in the chorus in "Thinking Out Loud." 12 13 Prior to his trial testimony, did Dr. Stewart have a 14 name for these second sets of melodies in each work? 15 A. Melody B. Q. And at a high level, what, if anything, did you find with 16 17 respect to the second set of melodies that Dr. Stewart has 18 placed in issue? 19 A. There are no relative similarities in Melody B other than 20 some contour similarity, which is very, very scant and thin. 21 But, once again, the melodies as notes are simply very 22 different. 23 Q. Are there musicological similarities between Melody B in 24 "Let's Get It On" and "Thinking Out Loud"?

- Q. What are we looking at, Dr. Ferrara?
- 2 A. This is my comparative transcription of the two melodies at
- 3 | issue that we call Melody B. On top is the passage from "Let's
- 4 Get It On" and on the bottom is the passage from "Thinking Out
- 5 Loud."

- 6 Q. Could you please play Melody B in each work on the piano
- 7 consistent with your transcriptions.
- 8 A. Yes. I'll give a few beats so you know what the beat is.
- 9 | 4 and 1 (piano played). TOL, 1 and 2 (piano played). I can
- 10 | play them back to back without interruption. LGO (piano
- 11 | played). TOL (piano played).
- 12 | Q. Can you please identify for us what has now been projected
- 13 on the screen.
- 14 A. As we did with melody A, given the scale degrees that are
- 15 written above the notes in the transcription on top, I've
- 16 simply brought them down into a chart of the scale degrees in
- 17 | the order in which they occur. And as you can see, when
- 18 pitches match, I've highlighted them in green.
- 19 Q. And just to be clear, if you look at the transcription at
- 20 | the top, you have halved the note values in LGO?
- 21 | A. That is correct, which is what it says, note values in LGO
- 22 are halved.
- 23 | Q. How many pitches line up in Melody B in each work?
- 24 A. As you can see, four pitches out of 11 in LGO line up.
- 25 Q. And if we look at the pitches that lineup, are they

- 2 A. Only two pitches, iii-iii, are consecutive, still
- 3 considered a fragment.
- 4 | Q. In addition to analyzing the sequences of the pitches, did
- 5 you perform an analysis of the rhythmic duration and metric
- 6 | placements in Melody B in "Thinking Out Loud" and "Let's Get It
- 7 | On"?
- 8 A. Yes, I did.
- 9 Q. Did you Dr. Stewart perform an analysis of the rhythmic
- 10 durations and metric placements in Melody B?
- 11 A. No, he didn't.
- 12 | Q. Did Dr. Stewart actually analyze the melody in this section
- of each song?
- 14 A. To the extent that we use Dr. Stewart's definition, which
- 15 | draws on the Oxford and Harvard dictionaries of music, he did
- 16 not because he failed to analyze the notes, that is, the
- 17 | harmonic beat, melodic rhythm and the metric placement and the
- 18 pitches.
- 19 | Q. What is the similarity that Dr. Stewart has identified with
- 20 respect to this second melody?
- 21 A. Essentially, that there is a descending contour that moves
- 22 | up at the very end, so a movement of the pitches down and then
- 23 up at the end.
- 24 | Q. Is movement of pitches down a scale, was that commonplace
- 25 prior to "Thinking Out Loud"?

- A. Yes. In fact, there are three basic contours, as you can a melody can go up (piano playing), a melody can go down (piano playing), or a melody can just simply have repeated pitches (piano playing). That's it, up, down, repeat. And so contour, in and of itself, does not provide an awful lot of information.
- Q. Focusing on descending down a major scale, was that something that was commonplace prior to "Let's Get It On"?
- A. Indeed, yes.
- O. Let's look at the next slide.

Can you please explain your findings regarding the rhythmic durations and metric placements of Melody B in "Let's Get It On" and "Thinking Out Loud"?

A. Yes, and I'll try to expedite this.

So, here, the differences in metric placement, but in particular in rhythmic duration are stark. For example, this begins with eighth note quarter note. This begins with eighth note 16th note. The 16th is literally a quarter of the rhythmic value of a quarter note. Putting it in another way, this note some to you in LGO is four times than the second note, some to me.

The continuation here of the disparity in the rhythm is really marked by these next three notes. You can see that there is a "3" in italics, the number 3 in italics. That's not a scale degree. That's the sign that tells us that these three

N52HGri2

notes into your, into your, are a triplet. They divide the beat into three, not into two or into four. So it becomes triple D, da da da. There's nothing like that in the LGO Melody B. So that is quite different.

And once again, the melody LGO has, if you will, a lot of starts and stops. For example, we have believe and then this is — this is off the beat, believe in love. Those are all off the beat. So what is the beat? We have (piano playing). All those are off the beat. Whereas, if you look at into your loving arms, it's all basically without any interruption of the beat (piano playing).

And those first three notes was the triplet, triple D da da da da da. That's into your loving arms, as compared with (piano played).

So the rhythmic durations, the metric placements are really quite different. The similarity, which is scant, is simply moving down from scale degree 5 to 4 to 3 (piano played) and then notice to 1 -- not yet, Mr. Duvall.

OK. It's 5, 4, 3, and then skipping to 1. That's the descent, 5, 4, 3, 1. What's the descent in TOL? 5, 4, 3, 2, no 1. So they don't even go in the descent in the same way.

And also notice the disparity in the number of repetition of scale degrees. There's one scale degree 5, just one, but there are three scale degree 5s in TOL. There are two scale degree 4s in LGO, but there are three scale degree 4s in

N52HGri2

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

17

18

22

- TOL. There are three scale degree 3s next, but only two in TOL, and so forth. And once again, you have the problem of the 1 as compared to the 2. The scant similarity is that, yes, they both turn up at the end on (piano played). But this is similar to suggesting that the word "crab," c-r-a-b, is the same as the word "absent" because they both have a-b. But the point is that a-b is preceded by different letters in these two words. That's essentially what we're finding here, these
- Q. Which notes in Melody B and "Let's Get It On" and "Thinking

  Out Loud" —

fragmentary and thin similarities that are simply meaningless.

- 12 A. I'm sorry. Could you speak to the mic.
- Q. Which notes in Melody B in "Let's Get It On" and "Thinking

  Out Loud" have both the same pitch in same metric position and

  the same rhythmic duration?
- 16 | A. None.
  - Q. Can you explain what was just projected on the screen?
  - A. Yes, it does, it correctly represents that.
- Q. Am I correct that the red Xs show the notes that do not share the same pitch or in the same metric position or the same rhythmic duration?
  - A. That is correct, they do not.
- Q. Did you also complete a combined analysis of the chords and the melodies in what Dr. Stewart has labeled "Melody B" in both songs?

- A. Yes, I did.
- 2 | Q. Can you explain to us what's projected on the screen?
- 3 A. Yes. So what we have here is the chords on top and the
- 4 same melody below with the same scale degrees. One of the
- 5 | interesting things about these corresponding, or not so
- 6 corresponding, melodies that Dr. Stewart has put in issue is,
- 7 | as you can see, they occur with in different parts of the
- 8 progression. Remember, the progression in D in LGO is D F
- 9 | sharp minor G A. Well, this starts in the midst of the F sharp
- 10 minor chord, the second chord of the chord progression, whereas
- 11 | in TOL it starts, actually, here on the G chord, which is the
- 12 | IV chord, not the iii chord, and then A, which is the V chord.
- Once again, as I mentioned, even though these chords,
- 14 particularly the A11, is actually what's sounding when we have
- 15 | the singing of take me into your loving arms, I am going to
- 16 | play that as a straight ahead A chord so that it is more like
- 17 | the A chord. I'm going to do the same in LGO. That is, I'm
- 18 going to make them as much as similar as possible with
- 19 | respect to the chord to the basic chord progression. So just
- 20 | A, not A7, just A, not A1.
- 21 If we can, if it's possible, Mr. Duvall, to circle
- 22 | this F sharp. Sorry to thrust that upon you on the spot.
- 23 MS. FARKAS: I think you need to go back a slide,
- 24 | Scott.
- 25 A. That's fine. We've got a yellow mark there.

Remember, F sharp minor is the second chord in the chord progression in LGO. The corresponding chord is D/F sharp. This is the second chord in the chord progression. If you could do a yellow slash through that as well.

So this tells you that at this point we're in the second chord. At this point we're in the second chord. So the chords themselves don't even align as you can see. The G with the F sharp, the G with the A, the A with the D, and so forth. But with that in mind, let's listen to the chord with the melody above it. So here's the F sharp minor chord, which is carrying over from the bar before it, three, four, one. Those are the only two notes (piano played).

If we look at the corresponding chord that is the second chord of the chord progression in TOL, there's no melody, so there's no — nothing comparable.

We next go to the G, and in LGO, we have "believe in" under the G (piano played). Again (piano played). If we look under the G in TOL, there are no notes. So once again there is no corresponding similarity with respect to the melody that is being combined with the chords.

And if we look at the A chord — again, not A7, I'm going to play it as the basic — and if we look at the notes that follow, it is this (piano played). Again (piano played). And we compare that to just a straight A chord here. Sorry (piano played). Again — that's the wrong chord (piano played)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- as compared with LGO (piano played). What is similar is that ending, da dum, two notes, a-b, crab, absent.
  - Q. To be clear, Dr. Ferrara, did you find any musicological evidence that Melody B in TOL was copied from Melody B in sorry, let me start that again.

Did you find any musicological evidence that Melody B in "Thinking Out Loud" was copied from Melody B in "Let's Get It On"?

- A. No, no musicological evidence at all.
- Q. In fact, once again, did Dr. Stewart even analyze melody in what he called Melody B?
- A. Dr. Stewart failed to include in the analysis of melody the melodic rhythms and the metric placements.
- 14 Q. Without those two elements, are we talking about melody?
  - A. Pitches by themselves are not melody, that's correct.
  - Q. Let's move on to the third set of melodies, the melody at the beginning of the verse two in "Let's Get It On" as compared to the melody in the interlude of "Thinking Out Loud."

Prior to his trial testimony, did Dr. Stewart have a name for this third set of melodies?

- A. Yes, Melody C.
- Q. Does Melody C in "Let's Get It On" appear in the same part of the song as Melody C in "Thinking Out Loud"?
- A. No. As you stated, the Melody C in TOL is in the interlude, and there is no interlude at all in LGO.

N52HGri2

Q. At a high level, what, if anything, did you find with respect to the so-called Melody C in each song?

A. Once again, the similarities are bare, and what is similar

is essentially moving down the scale and repeating pitches as you do. So we know that the D scale has seven scale degrees, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. And when we're moving down from the high note, we call this D, which is scale degree 1. We call it 8. So 8, 7, 6 — essentially, what we have is just repeated notes

on 8, repeated notes on 7, repeated notes on 6, and so forth, but different numbers of repeated notes.

Q. Are there any musicologically significant similarities

between Melody C in "Let's Get It On" and "Thinking Out Loud"?

A. No, absolutely. The easiest way to talk about that lack of sufficient similarity is to think about an exercise that undoubtedly thousands and thousands and thousands of students practice every day on wind instruments and string instruments and, believe it or not, on the piano as well but particularly on wind instruments and string instruments.

I remember when my son in grade school was playing trumpet, and he would play an exercise, practice exercise, that, again, students do all the time. D, D, D, D — it would be 8, 8, 8, 8, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 8, 8, 8, 8, 7, 7, 7, 7, 6, 6, 6, 6, 5, 5, 5, or as triples, D, D, D, C sharp, da da da da (piano played). That's a trombone, da da da da da. That is a French horn. That's a violin (vocalizing).

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

16

17

19

How many times have you been in an elementary school and listened to an elementary school band doing that or a beginning orchestra, string orchestra, fourth or fifth grade (vocalizing). That is the similarity, but the similarity doesn't include four notes or three notes on each, it's a different number of notes on each scale degree.

Q. So let's look at slide 28, please.

What are we looking at on the screen, Dr. Ferrara?

- A. I'm sorry?
- Q. What are we looking at on the screen?
- 11 A. The top line is that Melody C that Dr. Stewart has placed at issue, and the bottom line is TOL.
- Q. Could you please play Melody C in each work on the piano consistent with your transcriptions on the screen.
  - A. Yes. Tapping out the beat in eighth, 1 and 2 (piano played). And now TOL, 3 and 4 (piano played).
  - Q. Now I'd like you to look at what's projected on the screen.

The same exercise as before, and that is to simply

- 18 And what are we looking at here, Dr. Ferrara?
- 20 transport the upper numbers over the notes down into a chart.
- 21 And as you can see, the notes highlighted in green tell you out
- 22 of this I think it's 15 notes in LGO out of those 15
- 23 | notes, five pitches, not notes but pitches, line up.
- 24  $\mid$  Q. And what are the arrows next to the 3 and the 5 on the LGO
- 25 | line stand for?

A. The change of direction. The interesting thing is that while the purported similarities in this descent starting on 8 and moving down, down to 6 here but down to 5 here, suddenly a complete change of direction and contour. Instead of going down, we now leap up, and because of that, we need to note that this 3 is moving up and not down. Because if we look at 5 and think of 3, we might think it's this, like down here.

Can you adjust that, Mr. Duvall? Sorry. Thank you.

At the very end of TOL we have 5, 3 (piano played). We have 5, 3 here as well, but it's going in the other direction. Instead of (piano played), it's a completely different melody (piano played).

And so in order to show the reader that, I put an upward arrow 3 to show that, in fact, this 3 is not below this 5 like it is in TOL, but, in fact, it goes in the opposite direction and a huge leap. And then we have 3 going up to 5 again. So to show that this 5 is not this 5, it's a whole octave, 12 half steps apart, to show that this 5 is not the lower 5 once again an arrow.

These leaps at the end are completely different from an almost completely stepwise descent, say, for the last smaller interval of a third (piano played) as compared to (piano played) and then another leap down. So the contour is quite different. The only similarity in the contour is at the beginning, and it's different as you can see 8, 8, two 8s,

three 8s, three 7s, two 7s, and then very important, in TOL after the three 7s, the descent continues. It's never interrupted, 6, 6, 6, 5, 5.

Notice what happens in LGO, 8, 8, 7, 7 descent, but then it goes up, back up to 8, and then 7, 7, and then a single 6 as compared with three 8s, three 7s, three 6s, three 5s.

These are really completely different melodies, only similar by the fact that they have some number of notes that are repeating on descending scale degrees. And, again, what we're talking about is an exercise that thousands of students practice every day on wind and instrument and string instruments.

- Q. Did you perform an analysis of the rhythmic durations and metric placements in Melody C of "Let's Get It On" and "Thinking Out Loud"?
- A. Yes. And because I'm going on much too long, and I apologize, if you know, the melodic rhythm in TOL is marked by these triplets, da da da, da da da, da da da, da da, and then two 8s, da da da, da da da, da da da, which is completely different from the melodic rhythm here (piano played).

And let's just compare that barely similar part to this. So play LGO one more time, we're all sensitive people, and then we're just going to go right to the la la la (piano played). TOL (piano played).

Q. Did Dr. Stewart perform an analysis of the rhythmic

- 1 durations and metric placements in Melody C?
- 2 | A. No.
- 3 Q. Which notes in Melody C in "Let's Get It On" and "Thinking
- 4 | Out Loud" have the same pitch, the same rhythmic duration, and
- 5 | the same metric placement?
- 6 A. None that line up.
- 7 Q. Did you find any significant similarity between Melody C in
- 8 | "Let's Get It On" and Melody C in "Thinking Out Loud"?
- 9 A. None.
- 10 | Q. So what is the similarity that Dr. Stewart has identified?
- 11 | A. Kids practicing (piano played). That's it. Once again,
- 12 | with a different number of notes on each of those descending
- 13 scales, and in one case, LGO, going up and then going back
- 14 down; and in the case of TOL, only going down.
- 15 | Q. Has this repeating pitches on descending scale degrees
- 16 | similarities been used in other songs that use the combination
- 17 of the chord progression and anticipation at issue in this
- 18 | case?
- 19 | A. Yes. "Since I Lost My Baby" as recorded by I've
- 20 | forgotten.
- 21 | Q. Want to see if you can get it? Mr. French.
- 22 A. Yes, Ray French. OK. So Ray French, 1966 release of
- 23 | "Since I Lost My Baby," here's the introduction. This is in
- 24 | the key of E. Would you like me to play it?
- 25 Q. Sure.

A. OK. All right. This is in the key of E. This is scale degree 8. Remember (piano played). Ray French 1966, "Since I Lost My Baby" (piano played).

What we just heard was 8, 8, 8, 7, 7, 6, 6, 6, 5, 5. That's actually closer to the melody in TOL than the melody at issue in LGO is to TOL. Furthermore, it has the identical LGO chord progression and anticipation (piano played). This is the basic chord progression in LGO (piano played). Ray French (piano played). And if we add the melody (piano played).

Q. We'll return to that song a little bit later.

Staying with Melody C, did you also perform a combined analysis of the chords and the melodies in what Dr. Stewart has labeled Melody C?

A. Yes, and here the chords line up so D, F sharp minor, G, A, D, D/F sharp, G, A. And if we simply play the notes, I'll play the chord and the notes that are sounding in the vocal with it from the beginning just in the first bar, so we're all sensitive people. I'll put the melody up here (piano played) so that we don't run into the chords below.

So three, four, one, two (piano played). The notes again (piano played). Here it is, the D on all (piano played). So that's going from all sensitive p-. Those are the notes that are sounding with the F sharp minor chord (piano played). And the corresponding chord in TOL is D/F sharp. Here we are, and there's just two la la notes there, so (piano played), as

compared with (piano played).

Moving ahead with G, we have just one note (piano played). That's it. In G here, we have the 8, 7, 7, 7 also on the la's (piano played). And finally on the A, a real difference in the melody with those huge leaps upward, there's the A with with so much, as compared with the notes with A here in TOL (piano played). So LGO (piano played) As compared with (piano played). So the chords don't save the differences in the melody. If anything, it shows how different the melodies are.

Q. Continuing with this third set of melodies, Dr. Stewart also compared the vocal melody at the beginning of verse two in "Let's Get It On" to the guitar melody in the interlude of "Thinking Out Loud."

Is the guitar melody in the interlude of "Thinking Out Loud" meaningfully different from the vocal melody in the interlude of "Thinking Out Loud" we were just discussing?

A. No. In fact, the only difference is there is an extra note on this rest right here. So instead of da da da, it's da da da da, but exactly the same note, 8, 8, 8, instead of these two

8s. And here at the bottom instead of 5, 3, it's 5 — it is 5,

5. So what you hear — here's the vocal, la, la, la. Here's the guitar (piano played).

That's it. So only one extra note up front and one slightly changed pitch at the end. Otherwise, the sung part of

Melody C in the interlude of TOL, it's essentially the same, with those two exceptions, as compared to the guitar melody.

Q. So do all of your opinions and conclusions regarding the vocal melody in the interlude of "Thinking Out Loud" also apply with respect to the guitar melody in the interlude of "Thinking Out Loud"?

A. Yes, they do.

Q. Dr. Ferrara, in sum, what is your opinion of Dr. Stewart's conclusions regarding Melody C, including both the vocal melody and the guitar melody, in the interlude of "Thinking Out Loud"?

A. Putting the combination together, the underlying chord progressions, first, are not the same. But even if they were, even if, for example, we were talking only about a I-iii-IV-V chord progression, the basic chord progression in LGO, we're talking about a musical building block that was in 80 songs prior to TOL. So that in and of itself is not — is not meaningful.

Importantly, though, that chord progression is not the same in TOL. The anticipation is — is essentially not the same because of the four bar, remember the four bar phrase in LGO but the two bar phrase in TOL? Did I cut it in half for the purpose of analysis? Of course, but the point is it doesn't change the fact that the deposit copy is in that longer format, and so the anticipation is not the same. But even if you say, well, they sound the same, the point is that they are

not the same on the sheet music, but even still then I found other works that also embody that combination besides the Ray French song.

Finally, when you add the melodies — I think I've demonstrated that when you add the melodies to that chord progression, it actually undermines any similarity because the melodies are so different. So the combination doesn't help when you add melody to the chord progression and the anticipation therein.

- Q. Did you find any musicological evidence that Melody C in "Thinking Out Loud" was copied from Melody C in "Let's Get It On"?
- 13 A. None at all.
- Q. Once again, did Dr. Stewart even analyze melody in what he calls Melody C?
  - A. Due to the omission of necessary parts of the analysis, the answer would be, since he delimited his analysis to pitches and contour, no, he didn't complete an analysis of melody.
  - Q. I'd like to direct your attention now to Dr. Stewart's testimony regarding similarities in the modal quality between "Let's Get It On" and "Thinking Out Loud."

What is your understanding of the modal quality that he was referring to?

A. He's correctly referring to a kind of blues infusion in "Let's Get It On." There's no question that it is there, and

- 1 | it's prominent in the use of the blue third (piano played).
- 2 | That's part of the opening phrase. There are five blue notes
- 3 | in the first part of "Let's Get It On" (piano played). That
- 4 has a distinctive blue note quality.
- Q. Are there any blue notes in the vocal melody of "Thinking
- 6 Out Loud"?
- 7 A. I did not find any blue notes in the vocal melody in
- 8 | "Thinking Out Loud."
- 9 Q. To be clear, does Ed Sheeran sing any blue notes in the
- 10 | commercially released recording of "Thinking Out Loud"?
- 11 A. I don't hear any blue notes in Ed Sheeran's vocal.
- 12 MS. FARKAS: Yeah, I think we've covered this before,
- 13 | Scott. Thank you.
- 14 | Q. Setting aside vocal melody, do the instrumental parts in
- 15 | "Thinking Out Loud" include any blue notes?
- 16 A. Yes, in the guitar part there's a guitar solo. That's
- 17 | not to be confused with Melody C. There's a before in fact,
- 18 | together with Ed Sheeran's la, la, la, la, la, la, with
- 19 | that la, la, la descending melody, there's a guitar solo that's
- 20 | already begun and continues. That's not the descending Melody
- 21 C guitar solo. In that guitar solo at the start of the
- 22 | interlude, there are three E Sharps. They're actually written
- 23 | as E sharp in the published sheet music, which is the same as F
- 24 | natural. So there are three blue notes in the guitar solo in
- 25 | the interlude of TOL.

- Q. Just to be clear, are there any blue notes in the Melody C quitar melody that we analyzed earlier?
  - A. None.

3

6

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Did Dr. Stewart transcribe any blue notes in Melody C in "Let's Get It On" during his testimony?
  - A. Yes.

On"?

- Q. You testified that there are three blue notes in the guitar solo melody in the interlude of "Thinking Out Loud." Are there any blue notes in any instrumental melodies in "Let's Get It
- 11 A. There are no instrumental melodies in "Let's Get It On."
  - Q. In summary, what is your opinion of the purported similarity that Dr. Stewart has identified with respect to the modal qualities in blue notes?
    - A. There's no question that there is a wonderful and rich blues infusion through the use of the blue note in "Let's Get It On." The use of the blue note in the guitar solo does not add a that level of blues infusion. There's simply in the vocal part there really isn't a blue note present. And so, in fact, the modalities are different. And I mention this. It will just take ten seconds. Remember, this is the modality of the melody in the opening, in fact, the opening phrases of "Let's Get It On" I'm sorry, of "Thinking Out Loud." It's pentatonic (piano played). That is quite different in modality

to the wonderful blues infusion of (piano played) in "Let's Get

It On."

Q. Earlier in your testimony, you testified that you found songs that combine this basic — same basic chord progression at issue in "Let's Get It On" or "Thinking Out Loud" and the anticipation that the plaintiffs have placed in issue in this case.

Excluding songs authored by Van Morrison, which we'll go over separately, how many songs did you find that combined the chords at issue with the anticipation of the second and fourth chords?

- A. Six songs.
- Q. What, if anything, is the significance of these songs to your opinion in this case?
  - A. It shows that, first, "Let's Get It On" is not the first song to have combined these elements. That, in fact, other songs created prior to LGO and in one case between LGO and TOL used the LGO chord progression and anticipation, and in two other cases from those remaining from the six that we just mentioned, one also predates LGO and one is after LGO but before TOL.

What that tells me is that, once again, not only was LGO not the first, but, importantly, that this unremarkable combination of a building block chord progression, basic chord progression, and a century's old building block called "anticipation" is simply not remarkable in LGO or in TOL.

- 1 These are commonplace elements that can easily be put together.
- Q. Are you familiar with the song "You Lost the Sweetest Boy"
- 3 recorded in 1963 by Mary Wells?
- 4 A. Yes, I am.
- Q. And does that song combine the I-iii-IV-V chord progression
- 6 with anticipated second and fourth chords?
- 7 A. Yes, it does.
- 8 Q. And in addition to combining the chord progression and the
- 9 | harmonic rhythm at issue, does "You Lost the Sweetest Boy"
- 10 | include any melodic similarities to "Let's Get It On" or
- 11 | "Thinking Out Loud"?
- 12 A. Yes, it does.
- 13 | Q. In what key is "You Lost the Sweetest Boy"?
- 14 A. "You Lost the Sweetest Boy," once again, released in 1963,
- 15 ten years before the creation of LGO, is in the same key as
- 16 | LGO, the key of E flat major.
- 17 | Q. Dr. Ferrara, did you prepare any charts or graphics that
- 18 could demonstrate your testimony on this point?
- 19 | A. You're looking at the graphic summary. Here we go with the
- 20 | graphic itself. And so you may recall that this is the kind of
- 21 | graphic that I used for the two songs at issue, for LGO and
- 22 | TOL, but what is important here and the pointer is not
- 23 working, Mr. Duvall what's important here is that I have
- 24 | halved the there we go on the top line I've halved the
- 25 | four bars into two bars. And I mentioned that earlier, I think

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

I've explained why, to facilitate the comparison.

But what you'll notice is TSB is "You Lost the Sweetest Boy," so this is the Mary Wells song. You can see that the 1, 3, 4, 5 line up identically in harmonic rhythm, and of course, they are the same basic chord progression, whereas with respect to TOL, the harmonic rhythm lines up, but there is a I-iii chord. This is the same thing down here. It's now tripartite rather than just LGO and TOL.

- Q. What has been added to the screen?
- A. I'm sorry?
- Q. What has been added to the screen?
  - A. We just added the earlier chart of just LGO and TOL where you can see, in fact, in the deposit copy the chord progression is four bars in LGO, not two. For the purposes of analysis, I've halved it here to two plus two plus two, but it still
- 16 remains four as I explained before.
  - Q. And if the harmonic rhythm of "Let's Get It On" and
    "Thinking Out Loud" were the same, would that be significant to
    you?
- A. No, it would not. It's a commonplace harmonic rhythm. I clapped it out several times earlier.
- Q. And what, if anything, does the chart projected on the
  screen show with respect to the similarity in the harmonic
  rhythm in "Let's Get It On," "Thinking Out Loud," and "You Lost
  the Sweetest Boy"?

- A. What it shows is that every chord in TOL is either shared with TSB, "The Sweetest Boy," or is simply not the same as LGO.
- 3 Q. If we were to place a red "X" over each chord in "Thinking
- 4 | Out Loud" for which any harmonic similarity is also found in
- 5 | "The Sweetest Boy" and/or is not shared between LGO and TOL,
- 6 | would any harmonic similarity remain between "Let's Get It On"
- 7 and "Thinking Out Loud"?
- 8 A. No, none would remain.
- 9 Q. And just to be clear, can you explain what you mean by
- 10 | "harmonic similarity."

- 11 A. By "harmonic similarity," I mean similarity in the chords,
- 12 | that is, the basic chord progression, which we've gone over,
- 13 | and also the harmonic rhythm, that is, with 1 and 3, in this
- 14 case on the downbeat, and 2 and 4 anticipated.
- 15 | Q. Dr. Ferrara, using the sheet music projected on slide 46,
- 16 could you please explain the harmonic and melodic similarities
- 17 | you found in "You Lost the Sweetest Boy" as compared to "Let's
- 18 | Get It On" and "Thinking Out Loud."
- 19 | A. Yes. So what we have on the left is the first page of the
- 20 | published sheet music of "You Lost the Sweetest Boy." And
- 21 | starting here, we actually have the chord progression that is
- 22 | the same as the basic chord progression in LGO with the
- 23 | anticipation. I'll play it (piano played). 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2,
- 24 | 3, 4. So it is the same. It occurs two times.
  - Q. And what about I'm sorry, what about the melodic

similarities?

A. We have to go back, please, to the other slide. Thank you.

So in the very same place, right down here at the bottom, here's the opening melody, so (piano played). Again (piano played). And if I continue with the chord progression. (piano played). Listen to those opening notes, 3, 5, 6, 5, 3 (piano played).

OK. Those are the same opening notes as TOL (piano played), TOL. (Piano played) Mary J. Wells ten years before the creation of LGO.

Now, what's really important is that's not meaningful. That's the kind of analysis that Dr. Stewart did, oh, we've got five notes or four notes — not even notes, five pitches, and so forth, lining up. It's not meaningful. I'm not suggesting it is. I'm simply trying to make clear that, based on the criteria used and the analysis used by Dr. Stewart, that those similarities that he found are in a song that was released ten years before "Let's Get It On."

- Q. And are there any blue notes in this song?
- A. Yes. If we could now go to the next, we're on the second page now here of "You Lost the Sweetest Boy," and there is again a wonderful switch in the modality starting there with the title lyrics, And lost the sweetest boy that you had that time, the sweetest boy that you had.

So here is that melody now with the title lyrics

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

1 | (piano played). Da da dum, 3, 2, 2, that's a blue 3, 2, 2, 3,

2, 2. And of course, you can see here this is the deposit copy

3 of "Let's Get It On," those very notes (piano played)

So is that significant, that in addition to having the chord progression and the harmonic rhythm, there's some blue notes that we can point to? No, it's not. It's just simply answering a charge that it is significant in "Let's Get It On" and TOL, or in many cases with respect to TOL, it's not

- existent.
- 10 Q. Let's move on to the next song. You mentioned "Since I
- 11 Lost My Baby" by Ray French earlier?
- 12 | A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Does that song combine the I-iii-IV-V chord progression
- 14 | with anticipated second and fourth chords?
- 15 A. Yes, as I performed and explained.
- 16 | Q. And when was that song released?
- 17 A. 1966.
- 18 Q. In addition to combining the chord progression and the
- 19 | harmonic rhythm at issue, does "Since I Lost My Baby" contain
- 20 | any melodic similarity to the "Let's Get It On" or "Thinking
- 21 | Out Loud"?
- 22 A. Yes, the descending.
- 23 | Q. That's what you demonstrated to us earlier, correct?
- 24 A. That's correct.
- 25 | Q. In what key is "Since I Lost My Baby"?

- 1 A. It's in the key of E, which is a half step above E flat.
- 2 | That is the key of "Let's Get It On." So the relationship is
- 3 the same as the relationship with the TOL, which is a half step
- 4 | below E flat. So TOL in key to LGO is essentially the same as
- 5 | the 1966 Ray French in key to LGO.
- 6 | Q. Dr. Ferrara, we looked at charts and crossed out musical
- 7 | transcriptions for the previous song "You Lost the Sweetest
- 8 Boy." Did you prepare similar charts and transcriptions for
- 9 | "Since I Lost My Baby"?
- 10 | A. Yes, I did.
- 11 | Q. And if we were to go through the same exercise for "Since I
- 12 | Lost My Baby" and if you were to play the chords and the
- 13 | harmonic rhythm of that song on the piano, would it show the
- 14 | same thing with respect to the chord progressions and harmonic
- 15 | anticipation as in "You Lost the Sweetest Boy"?
- 16 A. It would. It would show that, once you made that
- 17 | comparison, that no chords remain in TOL that aren't in, in
- 18 | this case, "Since I Lost My Baby" or that are not shared with
- 19 | LGO.
- 20 | Q. Are you familiar with the song called "Georgy Girls" by 101
- 21 | Strings Orchestra?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 | Q. Does that song combine the I-iii-IV-V chord progression
- 24 | with anticipated second and fourth chords?
- 25 A. Yes, it does.

- Q. When was that song released?
  - A. Song was released in 1967 by 101 Strings.
- Q. Are there other versions of "Georgy Girl" recorded by
- others that also use the same chords and anticipate the second and fourth chords?
- 6 A. Yes. The Boston Pops also had in the following year, 1968,
- 7 | their own arrangement of the same song, "Georgy Girl," and it
- 8 was in fact in E flat, the same key as "Let's Get It On." So
- 9 | that was five years, 1968, five years before "Let's Get It On,"
- 10 and there is also The Seekers version in 1967. 1967, I have to
- 11 | say, that the bass part doesn't include the anticipation. It's
- on the beats, but the guitar part anticipates the notes. So
- 13 (piano played).
- 14 The vocal melody and the and the guitar part do
- 15 anticipate, whereas in the other two versions, the 101 Strings
- and the Boston Pops, they're dead on. They have the same chord
- 17 | progression and the same anticipation in a much more full way.
- 18 Q. Dr. Stewart testified that "Georgy Girl" supposedly sounds
- 19 | nothing like "Let's Get It On" or "Thinking Out Loud." Do you
- 20 have a response to that?
- 21 | A. First of all, it doesn't matter whether it sounds alike.
- 22 | The key here for a musicologist is, to the extent that you're
- 23 | saying that someone has copied expression from your work and
- 24 you believe that you have some level of ownership thereof, the
- 25 key is are there other works, in this case, that predate LGO

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

that embody that same expression? That's what counts. Whether it's written for a symphony orchestra or for a rock band, a musicologist moves into the underlying music and ultimately shows empirically whether or not that expression is in the earlier works.

And of course, the other point that I guess makes this moot is that the deposit copy in LGO is sheet music. It's not a sound recording, it's sheet music.

- Q. Dr. Ferrara, we looked at charts and crossed out musical transcriptions for "You Lost the Sweetest Boy." Did you prepare similar charts and transcriptions for "Georgy Girl"?
- 12 A. Yes.
  - Q. If we were to go through the same exercise for "Georgy Girl" and if you were to play the chords and the harmonic rhythm of "Georgy Girl" at the piano, would it show the same thing with the respect to the chord progression and harmonic anticipation as "You in Lost the Sweetest Boy"?
    - A. Yes, all of the chords in TOL would be X'd out.
  - Q. Let's move on to the next song.

Are you familiar with a song called "I've Got Love on My Mind" by Natalie Cole?

- A. Yes.
- 23 | Q. Do you recall when that song was released?
- 24 | A. 1977.
  - Q. Does that song combine the I-iii-IV-V chord progression

- 1 | with anticipated second and fourth chords?
  - A. Yes, it does.
- 3 | Q. And in addition to combining the chord progression and the
- 4 | harmonic rhythm at issue, does "I've Got Love on My Mind"
- 5 | include melodic similarity to "Let's Get It On" or "Thinking
- 6 | Out Loud"?

- 7  $\parallel$  A. It does.
  - Q. What is the key of "I've Got Love on My Mind"?
- 9 A. It's in the key of D major, the same key as TOL.
- 10 | Q. Dr. Ferrara, we looked at charts and crossed out musical
- 11 | transcriptions for the previous songs. Did you prepare similar
- 12 | charts and transcriptions for "I've Got Love on My Mind"?
- 13 A. Yes, I did.
- 14 | Q. And if we went through the same exercise that we've been
- 15 | talking about, would it show the same thing with respect to the
- 16 | chord progression and harmonic anticipation as in "You Lost the
- 17 | Sweetest Boy"?
- 18 A. Yes. Once again all of the chords in TOL would be X'd out.
- 19 Q. Could you please perform the chord progression and harmonic
- 20 | rhythm from "I've Got Love on My Mind" followed by the chord
- 21 | progression and harmonic rhythm from "Let's Get It On."
- 22 | A. Yes. Here it is, both in the key of D in "I've Got Love on
- 23 | My Mind" (piano played). The basic chord progression, that is
- 24 | the same.
- 25 | Q. You also mentioned melodic similarity to "Let's Get It On"

or "Thinking Out Loud." What melodic similarity did you find?

A. After three iterations of that I-iii-IV-V chord

progression, the basic I-iii-IV-V chord progression, it moves
to blue notes. So starting at the beginning, if you look right
here, I've got love on my mind, the title lyric, that's the
four-bar chord progression that repeats, it repeats again, and
then all of a sudden we go to these blue notes, and there's
nothing particularly wrong.

So we start with the chord progression and melody (piano played), and that was three times. Now listen, there's blues. Da da da da, that's lowered, 3 to 2 (vocalizing) that's LGO. This is Natalie Cole (piano played). This is after LGO. Many years before TOL, 1977, but after 1973. The key is that these similarities are not meaningful. They're simply using a common chord progression with a common anticipation, harmonic rhythm and, in this case, moving into some blue notes. These are blue notes that have been used for decades in countless songs.

- Q. Dr. Ferrara, did you find any songs that combined the basic I-I/3-IV-V chord progression in "Thinking Out Loud" with anticipated second and fourth chords?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And how many did you find?
- A. Two. One before LGO and one after.
  - Q. And could you name those songs for us?

- A. Yes. We just saw it on the screen. This is 1962 by The Contours, "Do You Love Me".
- 3 | Q. And when was "Do You Love Me" released?
- 4 A. 1962.

9

10

- 5 | Q. And what was the second song that you found?
- 6 A. "Six-Pack Summer." That's by Phil Vassar, and that's released in 2000.
  - Q. Dr. Ferrara, we looked at charts and crossed out musical transcriptions for "You Lost the Sweetest Boy." Did you prepare similar charts and transcriptions for these songs as well?
- 12 | A. Yes, I did.
- Q. If we were to go through the same exercise for "Do You Love

  Me" in "Six-Pack Summer," would it show the same thing with

  respect to the chord progression and harmonic anticipation?
- 16 A. Yes. Once again, in both cases, in "Do You Love Me" and
- 17 "Six-Pack Summer," all of the chords in TOL would be X'd out.
- Q. Could you please demonstrate the chord progressions from
- 19 "Do You Love Me" followed by "Six-Pack Summer" followed by
- 20 | "Thinking Out Loud" on the piano.
- 21 A. Yes, I'll put them all in D. So "Do You Love Me" (piano
- 22 | played). "Six Pack" (piano played). "Thinking Out Loud"
- 23 | (piano played).
- Q. Dr. Ferrara, we've now gone through a number of songs that
- 25 | feature the same combination of the basic chords in "Let's Get

It On" and "Thinking Out Loud" and anticipation on the second and fourth chords, some of which also included some limited melodic similarity to "Let's Get It On" and "Thinking Out Loud."

From a musicological perspective, what is the significance, if any, of these songs that combine these elements together?

A. With some of them it shows that this combination was not first in LGO; that, in fact, there were songs that predate LGO that use the combination, including, for example, the Mary Wells, the 1963 "You Lost the Sweetest Boy" that also have melodic similarities at issue. So that is significant because it establishes that LGO was not the first with respect to this combination and including some of the melodic similarities that have been thrown in here by Dr. Stewart.

In addition, it continues to undermine the claim of copying because it shows that, even before LGO, writers put these basic elements that are out there and commonplace together. It really undermines this claim of copying.

- Q. Using Dr. Stewart's logic, do you believe that "Let's Get It On" copied from "You Lost the Sweetest Boy" or any of these other prior songs?
- A. No, and I hope I made that clear. It is not my opinion that "Let's Get It On" copied these elements at issue from the songs that precede the creation of LGO.

- Q. Why is that?
- 2 A. For the same reason I just mentioned a moment ago, and that
- 3 | is we're talking about commonplace elements that multiple
- 4 writers have put together.
- 5 | Q. I'd like to draw your attention back to Defendant's
- 6 Exhibit 210. And if you look at the final entry on page 5, I'd
- 7 like to draw your attention to a song called "Better Than Me."
- 8 Who authored that song?
- 9 A. As you can see, Pete Riley and Amy Wadge.
- 10 Q. And do you know when "Better Than Me" was released?
- 11 A. My understanding is that it was released in 2012. As you
- 12 can see, there may be a 2013 other version of it, but certainly
- 13 before the writing of TOL in 2014.
- 14 | Q. What is the chord progression in "Better Than Me"?
- 15 | A. It's the same chord progression as in TOL. It's I these
- 16 are Roman numerals I-I/3-IV-V, yes.
- 17 | Q. And does "Better Than Me" also feature anticipated chords?
- 18 | A. It does. The second, third, and fourth chords of the
- 19 | four-chord progression I just cited are anticipated in "Better
- 20 | Than Me."
- 21 | Q. So what is the difference between the harmonic rhythm in
- 22 | "Thinking Out Loud" and "Better Than Me"?
- 23 | A. It's just one more chord anticipated, the third chord,
- 24 which is, of course, the third chord of the four-chord
- 25 progression, which is that IV. So there are three anticipated

1

2

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

19

- chords in "Better Than Me," the second, third, and fourth chords. There are two anticipated chords in TOL, the second and fourth chord.
- Q. Do you find that to be a significant difference?
- 5  $\parallel$  A. It is not.
- Q. What is the significance, if any, of "Better Than Me" to your analysis here?
  - A. It shows that this chord progression and this kind of anticipation was part of the writing of Amy Wadge before she joined with Ed Sheeran to create "Thinking Out Loud."
  - Q. And so how does that impact your opinion about whether "Thinking Out Loud" copies from "Let's Get It On"?
- 13 A. It further undermines the claim of copying.
- Q. I'd like to discuss Van Morrison, who Mr. Sheeran

  identified as one of his musical influences. Mr. Sheeran also

  mentioned some specific songs during his testimony. He

  mentioned "Crazy Love," "Tupelo Honey," "Have I Told You

  Lately," and "Why Must I Always Explain."
  - In assessing "Let's Get It On" and "Thinking Out Loud," did you analyze the works of Van Morrison?
- 21 | A. Yes, I did.
- 22 | Q. Broadly speaking, what did you find?
- A. I found that in some cases there were both harmonic and
  melodic similarities to works by Van Morrison and TOL,
  including some of the expression that's at issue now. And in

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

18

19

20

21

- two cases, "Crazy Love" and "Tupelo Honey," those were works
  released by Van Morrison before the creation of LGO.
  - Q. Can you please take a look at what's been marked for identification as Defendant's Exhibit 213A.

Do you recognize this?

- A. Yes. It begins with the published sheet music of "Crazy Love." Would you like me to —
- Q. If you can just identify what's in the document.
- A. OK. The next is "Tupelo Honey." This is all published sheet music. Next is "Checking It Out." These are all Van Morrison songs, published sheet music. "Tore Down a la
- MS. FARKAS: Your Honor, I'd like to move

Rimbaud", "Have I Told You Lately."

Exhibits 213A into evidence, please.

MR. FRANK: We'd stipulate to all of the sheet music they're attempting to put in. No objection, your Honor.

17 THE COURT: Received.

- MS. FARKAS: Mr. Frank, does that apply to 213B as well.
  - MR. FRANK: Yes, all of the ones under the subheadings.
- MS. FARKAS: Thank you.
- 23 (Defendant's Exhibits 213A and 213B received in evidence)
- 25 BY MS. FARKAS:

chords.

- Q. I want to direct your attention to 213B just for a moment.

  Can you identify that for us?
- Z Can you rucherry that for us.
  - A. Yes. This is another Van Morrison song, 1991, "Why Must I Always Explain," and this is not published sheet music. What you see on this first page is my transcription of the opening introduction, melody, and chords, and the verse, melody, and

On the next page, the final page of 213B, you'll see the same transcription but now transposed to the key of D so that it can be compared with the works at issue.

This is in the key of G.

- Q. OK. Let's talk about "Crazy Love." What did you find significant about "Crazy Love"?
- A. Well, both similarities in the chord progression and in the melody.
  - Q. Can you describe to us what the chord progression is, please.
  - A. The chord progression in "Crazy Love" is I-iii-IV-I. So in an LGO it's I-iii-IV-V (piano played).

In "Crazy Love," it's I-iii-IV, but then it goes back down to I. That chord progression continues through all of the verses. And very important, at the end — after the verses, we have a chorus. Listen to the chord progression and the melody. In fact, this is the famous chorus, *She gives me, love, love, love, love, crazy love* (piano played), and it continues (piano played).

And I want to call your attention to that first set of descending chords on *love*, *love*, *love* (piano played). And remind you of this (piano played). That's TOL. That's the end of the chorus of TOL (piano played). Chorus "Crazy Love" (piano played).

The melody is very close, in the key of D, scale degree 3, 3, 2, 1, and then moving down and then back up, that's "Crazy Love" (piano played). And what we have, of course, in TOL is (piano played). So instead of moving down to B, we move down to A (piano played).

So there is a real similarity in the melody, not just the pitches, the contour, but also the melodic rhythms, quarter notes that are descending, but of course the idea of having in the chorus and ultimately ending the chorus with descending chords is clearly very similar, so (piano played).

That's TOL (piano played). "Crazy Love," it continues (piano played). When you put that together with something else, and then I'll stop, when you put that together with this, this is now the — I think it's the fourth melodic phrase in the verses. Let's listen to this melody (piano played).

Again (piano played) 3, 5, 6, 5, 5, 3. What's the opening of TOL? (Piano played). So there is a real melodic similarity. There's a slight melodic rhythm similarity; that is, we have short, short, long. That's "Crazy Love," short, short, long. But otherwise, it's not a meaningful similarity.

Why? Because "Crazy Love" is based on pentatonic, and nobody owns pentatonic. And moving from 3 to 5 to 6, 5 to 3 is kind of a natural and expected thing when you're in a pentatonic mode.

So the point is that, yes, there are similarities of basic chord progression that is different with respect to the last chord and, of course, the second chord is the same as LGO. This is "Crazy Love," 1970, three years before "Let's Get It On," three years before LGO. So you have this aggregate of similarities in the chord progression and, of course, in the melody and then in this final chord progression (piano played). You put all that together, and we have a similarity that is not enjoyed to this extent with melody and chords and in this descending chord progression between LGO and TOL.

- Q. I think you may have answered this already, but are you suggesting that Ed Sheeran copied from "Crazy Love"?
- A. Not at all. Once again, descending chord progressions are something that is a commonplace idea. No one owns it. And, again, the use of the pentatonic and even (piano played), it's such a natural way to play this pentatonic scale and the use of a I-iii-IV-I chord progression, none of those things in and of themselves would suggest that Ed Sheeran copied from Van Morrison.
- Q. I'd like to direct your attention to Dr. Stewart's testimony regarding "Crazy Love" and slide 83 from his

presentation.

Could you please briefly respond to Dr. Stewart's analysis about "Crazy Love."

- A. Once again, if you pardon the expression, this is a failure of omission, or a failure by omission, that's more proper. And what do I mean by that? Remember I mentioned that the third or fourth phrase in "Crazy Love" is where we go (piano played).

  Well, that's omitted. Dr. Stewart's only put in the first two phrases. What Dr. Stewart has put into that, into that slide, is simply the chord progression (piano played), but what he's left out is not only this (piano played), that melody, but he's also left out the amazing (piano played) that's "Crazy Love."

  And it's not in Dr. Stewart's slide, so that's a failure of
- Q. Do you find it significant that "Crazy Love's" fourth chord is different from TOL and LGO?
- A. It's not a significant difference in and of itself.
- Q. Let's move on to the next song. What do you find significant about "Tupelo Honey"?

THE COURT: Ms. Farkas, could you come up for a minute.

MS. FARKAS: Sure.

omission and by omission.

(Continued on next page)

(At sidebar)

THE COURT: I'm not saying that it doesn't add something in each instance, but I'm getting a little worried about accumulation and Rule 403.

MS. FARKAS: So, your Honor —

THE COURT: How much more — how many more of these examples of what is essentially the same point do you have?

MS. FARKAS: So I hear you. The difference is I have about two or three more examples, but I can do one more and wrap up the other two without doing the examples. It was because we moved on to Van Morrison as opposed to the other ones who Mr. Sheeran has said is an influence. So it's a bit —

THE COURT: Excuse me.

MS. FARKAS: We moved on to Van Morrison songs, which is a variation on the theme because of Mr. Sheeran's testimony that Van Morrison was a significant influence on him.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. FARKAS: But I can try to expedite the conclusion. I am almost done.

THE COURT: I think —

MS. FARKAS: And I will do what I can do to get done faster than I was planning on getting done.

THE COURT: You will have my full support.

MS. FARKAS: Well, then I hear you loud and clear.

```
1
               (In open court; jurors present)
2
               THE COURT: Everybody needs a break. Ms. Farkas is
      almost finished. Would you like to take a break now?
3
 4
               JUROR: Please.
5
               THE COURT: Or can you wait until she finishes?
6
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: No.
 7
               THE COURT: OK. Right now.
8
               JUROR: Thank you.
9
               (Recess)
10
               (Continued next page)
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 (In open court; jury present)

BY MS. FARKAS:

2

- 3 Q. I'd like to talk to you briefly about "Tupelo Honey" by Van
- 4 Morrison. What did you find significant about "Tupelo Honey"?
  - A. "Tupelo Honey" was released in 1972, one year before LGO.
- 6 It includes the I-iii-IV-I chord progression that was in "Crazy
- 7 | Love, " but it also includes a I-iii-IV-V progression. Of
- 8 | course that is the chord progression in LGO. The fourth chord
- 9 | is anticipated in that chord progression. Whether it's the I
- 10 chord or the V chord, it's always anticipated. And the opening
- 11 | three pitches are the iii-V-VI opening three pitches in
- 12 | "Thinking Out Loud."
- 13 | Q. Let's talk about the next Van Morrison song called "Tore
- 14 Down a la Rimbaud." What, if anything, did you find
- 15 | significant about this song?
- 16 A. As you can see, this was released in 1984, after LGO but
- 17 many years before TOL. The introduction features the LGO
- 18 | chords, the verses feature the TOL chords; and with respect to
- 19 anticipation, the introduction includes the LGO chords and
- 20 anticipated second and fourth chords.
- 21 Q. Dr. Ferrara, during their testimony, Ed Sheeran and Amy
- 22 | Wadge both testified that the Van Morrison song "Have I Told
- 23 You Lately" features the same chords as "Thinking Out Loud;" is
- 24 | that correct?
- 25 A. Yes, it is correct.

- Q. Last one. I'd like to direct your attention to another Van Morrison song called "Why Must I Always Explain?" Can you tell us what's significant with that song.
- A. Yes. "Why Must I Always Explain?" was released in 1991, and it alternates between the "Crazy Love" chords, and that, of course, is the I-iii-IV-I, the LGO chords, the I-iii-IV-V, and the TOL chords, the I-I/3-IV-V, and it also includes the stepwise descending chord progression, and that is, of course, similar to the one in "Thinking Out Loud" that we went through in my testimony. As you can see, with respect to anticipation, "Why Must I Always Explain?," in those chord progressions I just specified, the second and fourth chords are anticipated; and also, here again, the opening pitches in fact, there are several opening pitches that line up with the opening pitches of TOL, and indeed they are more similar to the opening pitches in "Thinking Out Loud" than the opening pitches between "Thinking Out Loud" and LGO.
- Q. Overall, what do you find significant about the Van Morrison prior art that we have looked at?
- A. The Van Morrison prior art establishes that whether in his two works that predate LGO or the other works that are between the release of LGO and TOL, in both cases, they show that it's not remarkable that a great writer like Van Morrison, a great writer like Ed Sheeran, would take these otherwise commonplace elements and put them together and make them into a great piece

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

- of music. The underlying elements, though, are commonplace, and I take that away from the Van Morrison songs.
  - Q. And how does that affect your opinion about whether or not "Thinking Out Loud" copies from "Let's Get It On"?
    - A. It continues to undermine the claim of copying.
    - Q. Let's turn now briefly to the lyrics of each song.

From a musicological perspective, generally speaking, what importance do you place on lyrics?

- A. Lyrics are significant.
- 10 Q. Did you find any meaningful similarities between the lyrics
  11 in "Let's Get It On" and "Thinking Out Loud"?
- 12 A. No, I did not.
- 13 Q. Let's turn to song structure.

During his trial testimony, did Dr. Stewart adopt your analysis regarding the song structures of both songs?

- A. Dr. Stewart showed my structural analysis and appeared to adopt it during his testimony.
- Q. Did you find any significant structural similarities between "Let's Get It On" and "Thinking Out Loud"?
- 20 A. None at all.
- Q. I'd like to direct your attention to Dr. Stewart's
  testimony regarding the YouTube video of Ed Sheeran singing
  some of the lyrics of "Let's Get It On" over the chords of
  "Thinking Out Loud." Have you seen that video?
- 25 A. Yes, I have.

N521GRI3

Ferrara - Direct

- 1 Q. And do you find that video significant?
- 2 | A. No.
- 3 Q. Is it common for performers to do medleys or mashups or
- 4 | interpolations?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. In his performance did Mr. Sheeran alter any of the lyrics
- 7 | of "Thinking Out Loud"?
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. What chords is Mr. Sheeran playing while he's singing some
- 10 of the lyrics to "Let's Get It On"?
- 11 A. He's playing the same I-I/3-IV-V chord progression that's
- 12 | at issue in "Let's Get It On." He continues to play that chord
- 13 progression under the LGO lyric.
- 14 | Q. You identified the I-I/3-IV-V chord progression. That's
- 15 | the chord progression in "Thinking Out Loud," correct?
- 16 A. Exactly.
- 17 | Q. And so when you just said earlier, I think you misspoke
- 18 when you identified that as the chord progression of "Let's Get
- 19 || It On."
- 20 A. If I said that, I misspoke to be sure.
- 21 | Q. When Mr. Sheeran starts singing the lyrics to "Let's Get It
- 22 | On" in that video, does he sing those lyrics to the LGO vocal
- 23 melody or to the TOL vocal melody?
- 24 A. To the LGO vocal melody.
- 25 | Q. And so the melody that Mr. Sheeran is singing changes,

N521GRI3 Ferrara - Cross

1 | correct?

- 2 A. It changes from the TOL melody to the LGO melody.
- 3 Q. And does it correspond to Melody C that Dr. Stewart has
- 4 placed in issue?
- 5 A. It does.
- 6 Q. Dr. Stewart testified that he found it significant that
- 7 Mr. Sheeran segued from TOL to the lyrics of LGO, back to TOL.
- 8 Do you find that significant?
- 9 A. No.

14

- 10 Q. Dr. Ferrara, before we conclude, I just have a few more 11 questions.
- Did you analyze "Let's Get It On" and "Thinking Out Loud" in their entireties?

A. Yes, I did.

- 15 | Q. And briefly, what is your overall conclusion in this case?
- 16 A. I found no musicological evidence of copying. I found no
- 17 | significant similarities.
- 18 Q. Can students at the NYU Steinhardt School major in
- 19 | songwriting?
- 20 A. Yes, we have a bachelor's and a master's program in
- 21 songwriting.
- 22 | Q. And if the plaintiffs are awarded ownership of the chord
- 23 progression at issue, coupled with the rhythm at which the
- 24 chords are performed, how, if at all, would that affect the
- 25 | songwriting majors at Steinhardt?

N521GRI3 Ferrara - Cross

MR. FRANK: Objection. Calls for speculation. And also relevance.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MS. FARKAS: No further questions at this time.

MR. FRANK: May it please the Court.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. FRANK:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q. Dr. Ferrara, I want to thank you for being here today, and I hope you'll indulge me and be patient, as my musical
- 10 knowledge probably is not on par with yours.
- 11 First question I wanted to ask you, just so we're
  12 clear for the record, you seem to place a lot of emphasis
  - A. Could you speak closer to the microphone.
- 14 | Q. I apologize. Can you hear me okay now?
- 15 | A. I can.
- 16 | Q. One of the items that you analyzed in connection with the
- 17 | analysis that you provided for us here today is the
- 18 commercially available sheet music for "Thinking Out Loud,"
- 19 | correct?
- 20 A. I analyzed that early on before Judge Stanton's order, but
- 21 | with respect to the deposit copy.
- 22 Q. I understand. So is that a yes?
- 23 | A. Yes, I —
- 24 Q. Thank you.
- 25 A. said that I did, yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. And would you agree with me that the analysis that is at issue in this case for purpose of the jury's determination is the similarities between the studio recording of "Thinking Out Loud" and the deposit copy of "Let's Get It On"? Would you agree with that?
- A. Yes, the what is at issue is the composition embodied in the TOL sound recording and the deposit copy of LGO.
- Q. Thank you. I want to take the opportunity, Dr. Ferrara, to see if we might revisit a few items that were listed with respect to your pedigree and background.

First off, I wanted to know, are you currently an active — actively participating musician? Do you do gigs around town or play anywhere?

- A. I do not do gigs around town, no.
- Q. Was there ever a time where you did do that?
- A. Yes. In fact, starting when I was 14, having moved out of Brooklyn to New Jersey, I got into bands; worked my way through college right into and through a PhD playing in bands, playing, obviously, popular music.
- Q. Did you ever have occasion to play, just by way of illustration, a bar mitzvah or wedding, the general sort of gig circuit?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- Q. You did. Did you ever have occasion to play "Let's Get It
  On" at any one of these gigs?

- A. I don't recall ever playing that, no.
- 2 | Q. Did you ever have occasion to play any medleys in
- 3 connection with any of these gigs that you played a number of
- 4 | years ago?

- 5 A. Certainly medleys; not of the songs at issue, needless to
- 6 say, but certainly medleys.
- 7 Q. Okay. And when was the last time you actively were
- 8 performing as a musician?
- 9 A. I stopped band playing back in the early '80s, I guess, but
- 10 | I continued I'm also a pianist and I have accompanied some
- 11 great singers, and I continued accompanying singers well into
- 12 | the late '90s, and I also continued giving in some cases solo
- 13 recitals at the piano well into the 1990s.
- 14 | Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say that you haven't
- 15 | performed as a musician for maybe in excess of 20 years?
- 16  $\mid A$ . I I would qualify that by saying that I perform for my
- 17 | students in classes all the time. I use the piano as, you
- 18  $\parallel$  know, as a tool, and so —
- 19 Q. Sure.
- 20 | A. with that qualification, the answer would be, I don't
- 21 continue to perform as a professional pianist outside of the
- 22 | classroom.
- 23 Q. Thank you.
- Now I wanted to clarify with respect to the portion of
- 25 your CV that addresses publications. It looks like, if I

2

4

5

8

9

- understand correctly, that the last book you actually published was 2005; is that correct?
- 3 A. That's correct. That's per my testimony.
  - Q. And the but it listed on the CV that the book was actually a fourth edition, was it not?
- A. No. Fourth edition was 1993, fifth edition was 2005, which is exactly what I said in my testimony.
  - Q. So the 2005 was actually a new book -
  - A. 2005 I'm sorry. Go ahead.
  - Q. I'm sorry. Was that a new book that you published in 2005?
- 11 A. 2005 was a fifth edition with change of chapter, and what
- 12 | we did, Roger Phelps and I were co-writers of the fourth
- 13 | edition and and the fifth edition. And I had two junior
- 14 | colleagues at the time at Steinhardt, and we asked them to
- 15 co-write a single chapter on technology and research, and so
- 16 | that that's essentially what that fifth edition was about.
- Q. I understand. Could you tell us when the first edition was
- 18 actually written.
- 19 A. First edition goes way back. It was Roger Phelps's own
- 20 edition. So Roger is an institution in in research
- 21 methodology. He wrote a first, second, and third edition solo.
- 22 | He asked me to co-author the fourth edition. We also asked
- 23 another scholar, Thomas Goolsby, to also add a chapter, and
- 24 then again in the fifth edition, he asked me to to co-write
- 25 | the fifth edition with him, and I suggested those two junior

Ferrara - Cross

- 1 colleagues to do that additional chapter.
- 2 | Q. And I appreciate that, Dr. Ferrara, but I think my original
- 3 | question was: When did you write the first edition of the
- 4 book?
- 5 A. I don't remember. I don't know when the first edition of
- 6 the book as I tried to state, Roger Phelps is the sole
- 7 | author of the first, second, and third editions of that book.
- 8 Q. Can you specify for us when was the last time you published
- 9 a book of new material?
- 10 | A. Well, 2005.
- 11 || Q. That was that you said that was a fourth or fifth
- 12 | edition and it had some changes.
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. But it wasn't a completely new —
- 15 | A. Oh, it wasn't —
- 16  $\mathbb{Q}$ . iteration, was it?
- 17 A. As fifth and fourth editions aren't as well. There is —
- 18 | there are changes in the fifth edition as compared to the
- 19 | fourth. The fourth was quite a bit different than than
- 20 Roger Phelps's third edition, so the fourth is really largely
- 21 | fresh cloth. The fifth edition, I think your implication is
- 22 | correct that there's certainly material that was left over from
- 23 the fourth edition in the fifth edition, which one expects.
- 24 | Q. Do you have occasion, in connection with your research and
- 25 work, to go to conventions with colleagues and deliver

1 presentations?

- 2 A. I I do. I'm particularly active in the greater New York
- 3 chapter of the American Musicological Society. By the way, the
- 4 American Musicological Society is housed at New York
- 5 University, and so presenting at that chapter is is rather
- 6 | significant for me, and I noted that I've done five
- 7 peer-reviewed papers there since 2013. But to answer your
- 8 | question even more specifically, I don't tend to go to national
- 9 conventions, and I'll be happy to tell you why.
- 10 Q. I think I know why, Dr. Ferrara. I read a deposition
- 11 | recently, I'll represent to you, in a case that said you don't
- 12 | like to travel; is that correct?
- 13 A. That was during COVID.
- 14 | Q. Right.
- 15 A. You put that in perspective. That is exactly right. Like
- 16 many, I was very concerned about traveling during COVID.
- 17 | Q. Could you share with the Court how I don't think you
- 18 spoke to this in your direct testimony how you initially got
- 19 | into the field of musicological consulting.
- 20 | A. Well, I had already published in the '80s works in music
- 21 | analysis; and in the early '90s, probably by 1991, I was asked
- 22 | if I could complete an analysis with respect to a music
- 23 copyright matter. Soon after that, probably by 1992, I became
- 24 | involved as Andrew Lloyd Weber's musicologist, and in 1998, I
- 25 was his musicologist at trial in this Southern District of New

- York with respect to the *Phantom of the Opera* trial. So that's essentially how I came into this area.
- Q. That was your first involvement in litigation or consulting?
  - A. No. I believe that between 1992 and 1998, there were other litigations, but no other trials.
    - Q. Now you represented in your initial testimony on direct that you have worked for both plaintiffs and defendants in the past; is that correct?
    - A. That's correct.
    - Q. Could you share with the Court some of the cases over the last five years that you served in the capacity of a musical musicological consultant for plaintiffs.
      - A. In the last five years, no published, and by published I mean no copyright litigations that were actually filed. Before that, needless to say, yes, but in the last five years, I have done any number of analyses for potential plaintiffs that is, for parties who intend to make a claim, and in some cases those things were settled and so no published reports would be available. But I certainly have worked on behalf of plaintiffs and potential plaintiffs in the last five years; indeed, in every year in the last five years.
      - Q. What about unpublished reports? Who did you work for? Who retained you to provide a report?
      - A. Those would be confidential.

- Q. On what basis would you claim that they would be confidential?
- A. To the extent that that I had I was the consultant. Difference between a consultant and an expert witness is that a consultant does not have to be and in fact is not proffered to the other side. When you're an expert witness, you must be identified. We're talking about then potential plaintiff's cases that were early on settled, or they just walked away, in which case I was not identified. To that extent, that that
- Q. I understand that, Dr. Ferrara, but respectfully, you're not a CPA, a priest, or a lawyer, so could you identify what particular privilege you're asserting in not answering my question.

MS. FARKAS: Objection, your Honor.

work would be confidential.

THE COURT: Sustained. It's in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

- Q. Could you tell us how many times that you have served as a consultant for a defendant in the past five years.
- A. I would say that on average, I provide a report probably two to three times a year for a potential defendant, and so over the last five years, 10 to 15 reports would certainly be reasonable.
- Q. And I think you gave us a list of some of the individuals and entities that you've worked for in the past in your direct

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ferrara - Cross

781

testimony. But I also believe at the onset of your testimony yesterday you had occasion to say that you've represented clients in the past and you've given them some bad news, told them that there was an infringement, but they were actually happy about it, because you were truthful with them, and they came back to you. Do you recall that testimony? They weren't happy with the bad news, but — Could you tell us, share with the Court to whom you gave news that they infringed and they actually came back to you? MS. FARKAS: Objection, your Honor. I think that — sorry. Q. I'll withdraw the question. For the record, could you tell us about some of the parties that you have told had committed infringement in the past five years. Have you ever actually made a positive finding of infringement? I think there is an objection. MR. FRANK: Yes, there is. MS. FARKAS: I was waiting. Objection, your Honor. Would you repeat the question. THE COURT: MR. FRANK: Certainly. THE COURT: I understand you withdrew the earlier one. MR. FRANK: I did, your Honor, and I apologize.

THE COURT: Yeah.

should have waited until you were finished.

BY MR. FRANK: 1

Q. For the record, the question was: Could you tell us about 2

some of the parties that you have told had committed

infringement in the past five years.

5 MS. FARKAS: Objection. Irrelevant, outside the scope

of this expert's testimony. He is not a lawyer. I'll stop

there.

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

21

23

24

MR. FRANK: Respectfully, he's here to provide a musicological opinion, and I believe his specific testimony yesterday is, you should believe him because he is here for the music, and an arbiter of the music, arbiter, neutral arbiter, so what — I'm trying to probe whether or not he actually is in

MS. FARKAS: It's outside Rule 26, your Honor.

THE COURT: He's not required to answer the question.

He may if he wishes.

fact neutral.

17 BY MR. FRANK:

18 Q. Dr. Ferrara, would you like to answer my question as to

when you have found infringement on behalf of your clients in 19

20 the past five years? Would you like to take my invitation to

respond to that?

22 MS. FARKAS: Objection to form. Lacks foundation.

Q. Are you willing to give that information?

THE COURT: Doctor, you heard my ruling. Just follow

25 that and forget his interpretation.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

783

1 THE WITNESS: Thank you. Thank you.

MR. FRANK: Fair enough.

- A. So the answer is essentially the same. If a potential plaintiff be specific now, because you've actually earlier misrepresented my testimony earlier. So why don't you restate the question so I'm quite clear as to which parties you're asking about.
- Q. Absolutely. Has there ever been an instance in the past five years that a party has come to you for professional assistance and you have said that they committed infringement?
- A. You're saying that that party committed an infringement?
- Q. Well, they asked you for an opinion about whether they had infringed.
  - A. You're not being clear, so let's make it clear.
- 15 | Q. Please.
  - A. Okay. Are you asking whether a potential plaintiff and this is something that I mentioned early on in my testimony yesterday. So if you're asking did a potential plaintiff provide materials to you and did you say to that plaintiff, yes, I believe you have musicological evidence to support your claim —
  - Q. Actually, you raise a good point, Dr. Ferrara.
- 23 | A. That's what I want to know. Is that what you're asking?
- Q. I'm speaking directly with regard to a prospective defendant who's been accused of infringing who came to you and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ferrara - Cross

asked you for an analysis to determine whether or not they had infringed or not. Have you in the past five years told someone of that ilk that there is evidence to support the infringement?

A. Many, many, many times. And the point is, as I made before — it's twofold. In these instances, I am a consultant, and my understanding under Rule 26 is that as a consultant, all that is going on between that party and I is confidential. Once I become an expert witness, that is quite a different story.

But I will tell you — I'll give you an example. Just about a year ago — and again, there are just so many of these examples — a major publisher in Nashville, one of the, you know, the national major publishers, and their office is in Nashville, I was sent a work that received a claim - not a complaint, just a letter claim saying, we believe that your work, your song, has infringed our work. That publisher sent it to me, and I did a lot of work on it, and I said, I do believe there's musicological evidence of copying and I strongly recommend that you settle the case. I do that very frequently, and there's no question that that is why the motion picture companies and the publishers and the labels come to me, because they know I'm going to give them an honest opinion, even when it's bad news. They're never happy, contrary to what you — what you conflated earlier. They're never happy to get bad news, but they appreciate it.

Q. I see. And to be clear, you're declining to provide the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

Ferrara - Cross

785

names of the people involved in that scenario you just provided and you're not going to tell us the song.

- A. I'm sorry. Can you speak closer to the mic.
- Q. Are you in a position to tell us who you were working for and what song was involved?

MS. FARKAS: Objection. Rule 26.

THE WITNESS: Right.

MR. FRANK: I'll withdraw the question.

THE COURT: Well, the question is, is he in the position to, in a sense, substantially what I ruled he could do from his own knowledge. And we will respect it either way.

- 12 BY MR. FRANK:
- Q. Are you in a position to identify for whom you were working and what song was involved?
  - A. I would literally have to contact, in this case, that that company in Nashville and get permission to to state that. I could not break that confidence.
- Q. So as you sit here today and testify, you can't provide—

  you can give us generalizations but you can't provide

  identification of the specific cases—
- 21 A. Yeah.
- 22  $\parallel$  Q. is that fair?
- 23 MS. FARKAS: Objection. Asked and answered.
- 24 A. Yeah, I think I have answered the question.
- 25 Q. Thank you.

Dr. Ferrara, during your career as a musical — musicologist, rather, have you ever participated in a case where you were accused of being dishonest or failing to exercise candor in the proceedings?

MS. FARKAS: Objection, your Honor. If Mr. Frank is going to start venturing into other cases where Dr. Ferrara served as an expert and seek to elicit some sort of — to see whether if any courts have criticized his testimony, countless courts in this circuit, including the Second Circuit, have rejected attempts to cross-examine experts about opinions they provided in other cases and other courts' treatments of their opinions. It's irrelevant, it's utterly unrelated to this case, and it could potentially confuse the jury.

MR. FRANK: I think it's absolutely relevant as to credibility, and it doesn't go to his opinions, it goes to — it goes to motions that were filed in the case that I'm about to ask him about, with respect to the methodology employed.

THE COURT: Knowing that humanity has its failings and there are examples of overreaching, particularly in the music industry and litigation, I'm going to object to the form of that question. I will allow you to ask him if there was ever an occasion where a court found that he had acted improperly.

MR. FRANK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Charges of impropriety are easy to make.

MR. FRANK: I understand, your Honor.

N521GRI3 Ferrara - Cross

1 BY MR. FRANK:

- 2 | Q. Dr. Ferrara, you recall testifying in the "Stairway to
- 3 | Heaven" case?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. I believe it's affectionately referred to sometimes as the
- 6 | Skidmore case?
- 7 A. Yes.
- Q. Were there any issues adjudicated by the court with regard
- 9 to conflicts of interest or any other problems?
- 10 A. I'm very happy you asked that question. Yes, indeed. I
- 11 was engaged on behalf of Jimmy Page and Robert Plant of Led
- 12 | Zeppelin and Warner Music in that case, and ultimately went to
- 13 | trial.
- Some years before, I was contacted by Universal Music
- 15 || Group, who had some interest in "Taurus," the plaintiff's song.
- 16 | They called me. I completed an analysis. I can't tell you
- 17 | what that analysis was. It's confidential.
- 18 About perhaps a year later I don't know I
- 19 received a call from Warner Music asking if I could take a look
- 20 | at this case for them, and I gave them exactly that
- 21 | information. And they said, well, Universal Music is not
- 22 | suing; the estate of the writer is suing, but Universal Music
- 23 | is not suing. So I said, if you want me to to be a
- 24 | testifying witness in this case, you must get approval from
- 25 Universal Music Group for me to do that, which they did.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

Ferrara - Cross

And the key is now, specifically, the attorney for the plaintiff said that I had broken some kind of rule, federal — Federal Rule 26, by having a conflict of interest in having done an initial analysis and then done a subsequent analysis, even if my findings were the same in both. The district court judge said, nonsense, and dismissed that. The Ninth Circuit three-judge appellate court said, nonsense, and dismissed it. And the en banc panel, either nine, ten, or eleven appellate judges, said nonsense, and dismissed that claim.

So I'm happy you asked.

- THE COURT: For the record, the Court of Appeals opinion mentions his testimony in that case.
- "Ferrara is the qo-to expert for major industry players. 0. He gives them the opinions they want." Have you ever heard
- 15 that before?
- 16 No, I haven't.
- 17 You don't recall that from the Skidmore case?
- 18 No. Are you saying that the attorney for the plaintiff 19 said that?
- 20 From a pleading in the Skidmore case.
- 21 Are you asking — are you saying that the attorney for 22 Skidmore -
- 23 MS. FARKAS: Objection, your Honor. I think Mr. Frank 24 should not be quoting from advocacy pleadings. I think your 25 Honor had suggested that he stick to actual rulings.

Ferrara - Cross

789

1 MR. FRANK: Dr. Ferrara brought up the issue responsive to my question about the conflict of interest. 2 3 trying to delve into that. 4 THE COURT: The question is bad in form, and the 5 objection is sustained. 6 MR. FRANK: Thank you, your Honor. 7 BY MR. FRANK: 8 Q. Do you agree with that statement, Dr. Ferrara, that you're 9 the go-to guy? 10 MS. FARKAS: The objection was sustained. 11 MR. FRANK: I didn't ask — I asked a new question. I 12 asked him if he had heard that statement and I asked him if he 13 agreed with it. 14 MS. FARKAS: It's the same question, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Do you have a basis for asking that 16 question, Mr. Frank? 17 MR. FRANK: I do. Because the — I believe it goes to 18 - he spoke, when -19 THE COURT: Come up and make your offer here at the 20 side. 21 MR. FRANK: Yes, your Honor. 22 23 24 25

Ferrara - Cross

790

1 (At the sidebar) 2 THE COURT: When was that statement made and by whom and to whom? 3 4 MR. FRANK: It was made in a pleading in the Skidmore 5 case by the plaintiff, in a motion to disqualify Dr. Ferrara. 6 MS. FARKAS: In a losing motion to disqualify 7 plaintiff. THE COURT: Excuse me? 8 9 MS. FARKAS: It was in the losing motion to disqualify 10 Dr. Ferrara. The motion which the Court denied. 11 THE COURT: 12 MR. FRANK: I understand that, your Honor, but the 13 problem is that what we have here is that Dr. Ferrara -14 Ms. Farkas took extensive testimony yesterday from — trying to 15 make the point that Dr. Ferrara is neutral, he has no skin in the game, he is a neutral arbiter of whether it's infringement 16 17 or not. The fact that they put that there, they placed his 18 neutrality squarely at issue, and we have a right to probe 19 that. 20 THE COURT: And lost. 21 MR. ZAKARIN: And lost. Exactly. 22 MR. FRANK: I've got some more cases where — 23 THE COURT: Well, I want to see a basis for that 24 question. 25 MR. FRANK: I'll withdraw the question. I'll withdraw

N521GRI3 Ferrara - Cross the question. THE COURT: Well, that's up to you. MR. FRANK: I'll withdraw it. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Suit yourself. MR. FRANK: All right. I'll withdraw it. (Continued on next page) 

N521GRI3 Ferrara - Cross

1 (In open court)

BY MR. FRANK:

- Q. Dr. Ferrara, you indicated in your preliminary testimony that you're a full-time professor at NYU?
- A. I'm on the full-time faculty, that's correct.
- Q. Could you is there a distinction between being full time versus being full-time faculty?
  - A. No.
  - Q. So do you work the same amount of hours, same case I guess the same class load?
    - A. Yes. The standard class load for a full professor is two classes per semester; in addition, student advisement, thesis advisement. There are sitting on faculty committees. For example, there is a merit review of all tenured faculty, a large committee that takes quite a bit of time that I sit on, and there is the important promotion and tenure committee, and we talked a little bit about that with respect to someone moving from associate to full or assistant to associate. I sit on those committees and and work through those assessments of applicants for promotion and tenure.
  - Q. How much of your annual income would you say is attributable to this kind of work you do, working on cases?
  - A. I would say that it's about 60 percent, particularly when

     when there's a trial. I mentioned in my direct that over 30 years, this is probably the 10th trial, so on average, around a

N521GRI3 Ferrara - Cross

- 1 | trial every three years.
- 2 | Q. All right. But preceding the trials, would it be fair to
- 3 | say that there is quite a bit of prep work, depositions,
- 4 reviewing materials, coordinating with counsel, and presumably
- 5 you bill for all of that?
- 6 A. Yes, of course.
- 7 Q. Can you tell us when you were initially engaged in
- 8 connection with this case.
- 9 A. To the best of my recollection, it was in 2015.
- 10 Q. So eight years ago.
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. And what were you initially asked to do?
- 13 A. Initially, I was sent sound recordings by Sony of the two
- 14 works at issue and asked to complete an analysis.
- 15 | Q. Okay. So is it Sony that actually engaged you in
- 16 connection with this case?
- 17 | A. To the best of my recollection. It's been eight years, but
- 18 | I believe it was Sony. It could I could be wrong.
- 19 | Q. Well, presumably in the last couple months in the lead-up
- 20 | to trial, you've been giving bills to someone, correct?
- 21 A. Oh, yes.
- 22 | Q. And who are you giving the bills to?
- 23  $\parallel$  A. Bills to —
- 24 Q. Your invoices for your time.
- 25 A. Invoices. I'm trying to think whether they go to Pryor

Ferrara - Cross

794

- Cashman, the attorneys, or to to the Ed Sheeran management in the UK. Probably the latter, to Ed Sheeran management.
- Q. Well, presumably you've received a check responsive to
- 4 | those invoices a couple times; is that fair?
  - A. Yeah. As a bank wire, but yes.
- 6 Q. And who has cut the checks to you?
- A. Again, to the best of my recollection, it would be the company that manages Ed Sheeran. I don't recall the name of
- 9 that company.

- 10 Q. So it's Ed Sheeran's management company that's been paying
- 11 | you since 2015?
- 12 A. Oh, no, no. That you you had shifted to —
- 13 Q. Oh, okay.
- 14 A. to, you know, deposition not deposition to getting
- 15 ready for trial. So no. Back in 2015, I think it was Sony. I
- don't remember explicitly. But I would have been billed I
- would have billed Sony if that is the case and Sony would have
- 18 paid my fee.
- 19 Q. Okay. And this would have been I guess attributable to
- 20 when the case was still in a presuit posture.
- 21 A. That's right.
- 22 | Q. And you would have been giving an advisory opinion to Sony
- 23 | at that time.
- 24 A. That's correct.
- 25 | Q. If you were to aggregate all of the money that you've

- received since you were hired by Sony in 2015 through the 2 present, how much have you been paid to provide services on this case? 3
- 4 I don't think I can even find all of that information over Α. 5 the last eight years, so I really don't know the answer to 6 that.
- 7 Q. You have no idea how much you've been paid by the defendants in this case? 8
- A. No, I don't. 9
- 10 Could you give us a proffer, a ballpark figure. Is it a 11 hundred thousand, 200,000? Do you have a range?
- 12 It could — it would certainly — let me put it this way.
- 13 It would certainly be 100,000 since 2015, but one of the
- 14 reasons is because of the reports that went back and forth
- 15 initially that were pre the order by Judge Stanton about the
- deposit copy; and then in particularly the last four months and 16
- 17 in the last few weeks, the plaintiffs, to be quite candid, have
- 18 changed so many things and have caused me, therefore, to change
- 19 what I'm doing, for example, in the selection in arrangement —
  - Excuse me. I asked you how much —
- 21 Well, I'm giving you — Α.
- 22 Q. — how much you've been paid. How much have you been paid?
- 23 Do you have an answer to that or not?
- 24 MS. FARKAS: I think he's answering your question, if 25 you let him answer the question, please.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. FRANK: It's a numerical figure we're trying to identify, not the back story.

MS. FARKAS: You asked him how much, he said he couldn't remember, and then you tried to ask him how he can remember, and he's going through in his head how he can remember how much he billed.

MR. FRANK: He's using it as a subterfuge to criticize the plaintiff's expert, and I'd appreciate he wait until he's redirected before he does that. We just want to know how much money he's been paid, if he does.

THE WITNESS: I've already answered that.

MR. FRANK: You have to wait for the judge's ruling.

THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: He answered that he couldn't; he didn't have the figure.

MR. FRANK: Fair enough. Thank you.

BY MR. FRANK:

- Q. Dr. Ferrara, have you ever been engaged by this particular law firm that's defending Mr. Sheeran?
- A. I haven't been engaged by the law firm, but I have been engaged by clients of the law firm. So I in other words, I have done other litigation issues with Pryor Cashman.
- Q. Do you have a recollection as you sit here today as to how many times you've worked with Pryor Cashman?
  - A. Over the last few years that I can certainly remember,

Ferrara - Cross

797

probably three times outside of this case. It's hard for me to 1 2 say. And that was always for defendants, correct? 3 Α. Yes. 4 5 Have you ever done any work outside of this particular song on behalf of Ed Sheeran? 6 7 MS. FARKAS: Objection, your Honor. This is getting - anything outside of this litigation and this case I think is 8 dancing very close to violating your Honor's order. 9 10 MR. FRANK: I didn't say anything about cases. I 11 asked if he did some work, and we could certainly exclude 12 litigation issues. 13 MS. FARKAS: It's the same objection, your Honor. 14 It's irrelevant. 15 THE COURT: Let me see my order. 16 MR. FRANK: I think that was the order on No. 3, your 17 Honor. 18 THE COURT: I've got it here. 19 I'll read you the order so we all know what it says. 20 MR. FRANK: Yes, your Honor, I would appreciate that. 21 THE COURT: Because I know you're very desirous of not 22 violating it. 23

Yes, your Honor. MR. FRANK:

25

24 This was entered on October 5, 2020. THE COURT:

"There shall be no reference, mention, evidence, or argument

Ferrara - Cross

798

concerning any other litigation or claim of infringement 1 2 between the parties or any other parties and any defendant, or the outcome of any such claim. The trial shall be devoted 3 4 entirely to the facts and law involved in this case, and any 5 reference to other claims, copying, infringements, or 6 litigations are excluded under Federal Rule of Evidence 403 and 7 404." 8 MR. FRANK: Thank you, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: That order is still in effect, and I think 10 it's clear. 11 MR. FRANK: Thank you, your Honor. I'll move on to 12 the next question. 13 THE COURT: Be my quest. 14 MR. FRANK: Thank you. BY MR. FRANK: 15 Q. Have you ever been on the opposite sides of Dr. Stewart in 16 17 a case where he represented one side's interest and you worked on the other side? 18 19 Α. Yes. 20 Okay. Can you tell us the times that you did that. 0.

24

25

- 21 Well, the Led Zeppelin case, Dr. Stewart was the defendant
- 22 — was the plaintiff's musicologist.

23 Let's see. A little more recently —

And in fairness to my remarks that the THE COURT: Court of Appeals referred to Dr. Ferrara, they also referred to

Ferrara - Cross

799

1 Dr. Stewart.

2 MR. FRANK: Oh, great. Thank you, your Honor.

- 3 A. There's another case, Smith v. The Weeknd that's not Sam
- 4 | Smith, this is a different Smith, and The Weeknd was the
- 5 defendant, or a part of defendants. Dr. Stewart worked on
- 6 | behalf of Smith, I worked on behalf of The Weeknd. And so that
- 7 | case was dismissed. In fact, Dr. Stewart's report was
- 8 excluded. It's in the decision.
  - I know there's --
- 10 Q. What about a case in which you represented Mark Ronson in
- 11 connection with "Uptown Funk"?
- 12 | A. Oh, yes.
- 13 | Q. You were an expert for the defendant, Mark Ronson, were you
- 14 | not?

- 15 | A. Yeah. That never I don't think we even had depositions
- 16 | in that in that case.
- 17 | Q. This case was settled, was it not?
- 18 A. It was settled, yes.
- 19 | Q. Didn't you also provide consulting services for Justin
- 20 | Bieber and Dan + Shay in connection with a case called I
- 21 | think it's a song called "10 Hours"? Or was it does that
- 22 sound familiar to you?
- 23 | A. Yeah. That was recent, and I was not heavily involved in
- 24 | that case, but, yeah, I've done other cases for Justin Bieber.
- 25 | Q. Dr. Stewart was the opposing expert, was he not?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Thank you, Dr. Ferrara.

little work that I did in that case.

A. It's my pleasure.

MR. FRANK: Your Honor, I've been advised that we are getting close to the proverbial witching hour and that this might be a good point to stop, if the Court is so inclined.

THE COURT: We'll resume at the usual time tomorrow morning.

I promised during your selection that I would keep you posted, and — can you hear me now? Is this better?

JUROR: Yes. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you for — that I would keep you posted. And it's my impression that the case is growing towards the end and I expect it to close up within the next couple of days.

Does any counsel differ?

MR. FRANK: Your Honor, if I may --

THE COURT: I'm not an expert on these things.

MR. FRANK: And I would invite Ms. Farkas to tell me if I'm wrong, but it's my understanding that after this witness, the defendants are going to be resting. Is that correct?

MS. FARKAS: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: After they rest, the remaining work is closing arguments and charge, and before the closing arguments are held, I go over the charge with counsel so there are no surprises and they know what I'm going to charge and can address you accordingly. And normally that takes maybe a couple of hours on some day, and either later that day or early the next, the opening of the next morning, there will be the closing arguments and charge. The charge doesn't last terribly long — half an hour, perhaps; perhaps less. And then you have the case to decide.

So that's the remaining work to be done after the closing. And I would think — well, it depends on the length of the cross-examination, for one thing. That means it will be in your hands probably tomorrow or the next day.

See you tomorrow.

(Adjourned to May 3, 2023, at 11:00 a.m.)

1	INDEX OF EXAMINATION
2	Examination of: Page
3	LAWRENCE FERRARA PhD
4	Direct By Ms. Farkas 666
5	Cross By Mr. Frank
6	DEFENDANT EXHIBITS
7	Exhibit No. Received
8	210
9	201
10	202
11	203
12	204
13	212
14	214
15	238
16	213A and 213B
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	